This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER;

OR,

UNITARIAN

MAGAZINE AND REVIEW.

NEW SERIES, VOL. XVI.

FROM JANUARY TO DECEMBER, 1860.

LONDON:
EDWARD T. WHITFIELD, 178, STRAND.

1860.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
176974
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.

THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CLXXXI.] JANUARY, 1860. [Vol. XVI.

ULFILAS, THE FIRST TRANSLATOR OF THE SCRIPTURES INTO A MODERN LANGUAGE.*

At the time when public attention has been strongly called to the amendment of our Common Translation of the Bible, some interest may be felt in the life and labours of the man who gave to the progenitors of the German nation their first version of the Scriptures, and to Europe the first example of an attempt to substitute a known for an unknown tongue as a medium for the communication of revealed truth. The undertaking throws a lustre round the name of the man with whom it originated. If Gawaine Douglas had reason to be

> "More pleased that in a barbarous age
> He gave rude Scotland Virgil's page,
> Than that beneath his sway he held
> The bishopric of fair Dunkeld,"

honour surely is due to him who gave to a people much more barbarous two gifts of infinitely greater value, a vernacular version of the word of God, and at the same time the use of an alphabet.

The origin of the Gothic nation, which performed such an important part in the destruction of the old and the constitution of the new political system of Europe, is somewhat obscure. It seems most probable that they are the same with the Gothones of Tacitus, dwelling on the Baltic, though history gives us no information as to the events in consequence of which, in the commencement of the third century, they appear in great force on the shores of the Euxine. It is sufficient for our present purpose to take them up in the year A.D. 258, when in the distracted times of Valerian and Gallienus they ravaged Cappadocia and Galatia, and carried off thence a number of Christians, among whom were several of the clergy, who exerted themselves zealously and successfully for the propagation of the Christian faith. They healed diseases and cast out demons in the name of Christ, and by these acts of beneficence and a holy life they gained many converts. Among the Christians thus carried off were the ancestors of our Ulfilas, who are said to have lived near the foot of the Cappadocian mountain Parnassus. Arianism was

* Ulfilas. Die heiligen Schriften, alten und neuen Bundes in Gothischer Sprache. Von H. F. Massmann. Stuttgart. 1857.
Ueber das Leben und die Lehre des Ulfila. Von Georg Waitz Hanover. 1840.

VOL. XVI DUP EXCH 18 APR 1906
MEADVILLE THEOL SEM

not yet in existence, having its origin in the fourth century; nor is it known from what cause it spread so widely and so soon after its birth among the Gothic tribes. It is certain, however, that not only the Visigoths, but also their kinsmen the Vandals and Langobardi, held firmly to this form of Christian belief. Was it the love of independence, so characteristic of their descendants of German, Saxon and Scandinavian blood, which inclined them to take the side of heresy against orthodoxy?

The family of Ulfilas had been settled for sixty years among the Goths when he was born in the year A.D. 318. His name is evidently Gothic, and therefore it is natural to suppose that they had in the mean time intermarried with the Goths and were ranked with that nation. But it is probable that the knowledge of Greek letters and civilization which the captives had brought with them had not perished, and thus Ulfilas, by his double consanguinity, became a fit instrument in the hands of Providence for the work which he accomplished. Of his life till he reached the age of thirty little is known. The Goths were established on the borders of the Greek empire, and had frequent relations, sometimes friendly, sometimes hostile, with Constantinople during the reign of Constantine and Constantius. It appears to have been in A.D. 348, when Constantius occupied the Byzantine throne, that Ulfilas visited Constantinople as an ambassador from his nation. He had hitherto been simply a reader in the church, but on this occasion he was ordained a bishop. Philostorgius, whose work has been abridged by Photius,* says that Eusebius was one of those by whom he was ordained; but as Eusebius died in 342, there must be a chronological error in the date of his consecration, or in the statement that Eusebius took a part in it. One thing is certain, that it was at the hands of Arian bishops that he received his episcopate. The historian Sozomen (VI. 37) represents the Goths as not having been originally or wholly Arians when converted to Christianity; but attributes their adherence as a nation to this heresy to the circumstance that, subsequently to his being made a bishop, Ulfilas went on an embassy to Constantinople, and because the Arian prelates, who were in favour at the court, promised to forward his suit, "*or because he really thought they had juster views concerning God*," he joined the Arians and cut off the whole nation from the Catholic Church. Theodoret (IV. 37) gives a still more unfavourable account,—that the Goths "having received of old rays of divine knowledge and been nourished in apostolic doctrine," rejected the proposal of Valens, when he gave them a settlement on the south side of the Danube, to embrace Arianism; but that Ulfilas, their bishop, was partly persuaded, partly bribed by Eudoxius (an eminent person among the Arians) to bring over

* See the Epitome of Philostorgius in Valesius' edition of the Ecclesiastical Historians, Vol. II.

the Goths to the imperial faith. He adds that Ulfilas accomplished this by representing to them, that there was no real difference between the Arian and the Catholic doctrine, and that the quarrel had its origin in ambition. The Goths, therefore, he says, call the Father greater than the Son, but do not endure to call the Son a creature. The *odium theologicum* is so palpable in the insinuation that Ulfilas was bribed, that we need not concern ourselves with it. That he treated the whole dispute as a *logomachy*, and advised his Goths not to trouble their heads about the matter, and that the Goths, thankful for the refuge given them by Valens in Mysia, were ready to declare themselves of the Arian party, is credible enough. The general settlement of the nation on the right bank of the Danube, however, did not take place till A.D. 375, when the invasion of the Huns compelled them to leave their settlements on the left bank; and as Ulfilas died in A.D. 388, it is evident that Arianism among the Goths must have had a much earlier origin. Ulfilas and a part of the nation appear to have established themselves on the south side of the Danube in A.D. 355; Nicopolis, near the foot of Mount Hæmus, was the place of his residence. We have means of knowing what were the theological opinions of Ulfilas himself. Waitz, the author of the Dissertation of which we have given the title, has published a fragment of a MS., preserved in the Royal (National-Imperial?) Library at Paris, containing the remarks of a Bishop Maximinus on the speeches of other bishops at the Council of Aquileia held in A.D. 381. The object of the commentator is to controvert what was said by the Catholic bishops in that Council, and to confirm what was said by the Arians, especially by Palladius, bishop of Ratiara on the Danube, not far from Widdin, the region which, along with Mysia, where Ulfilas lived and taught, was now the chief home of Arianism. These remarks embody an extract from a letter of Auxentius, the Arian bishop of Silistria, in which he gives an account, unfortunately an imperfect one, of the life, teaching and creed of Ulfilas, and of a mission which he undertook to Constantinople, apparently in the hope of inducing the Emperor Theodosius to call a council, in which the Arians, if their doctrine were not declared orthodox, might at least obtain toleration. The mission was unsuccessful; Arianism was condemned, and Ulfilas probably died at Constantinople, at the age of 70, in the year 388. The letter of Auxentius contains an extract from his will, or confession of faith, which we give in the original Latin. Ulfilas, we are told, was master of the three languages, Gothic, Greek and Latin; and Latin was the legal and *documentary* language of the East as well as the West.

"Ego Ulfila, episcopus et confessor, semper sic credidi et in hac fide sola et vera testamentum facio ad Dominum meum. Credo unum esse Deum Patrem, solum ingenitum et invisivilem;

et in unigenitum filium ejus dominum et Deum nostrum, opificem et factorem universæ creaturæ, non habentem similem suum—ideo unus est omnium Deus qui et de nostris [?] est Deus—et unum spiritum sanctum, virtutem inluminantem et sanctificantem—ut ait Christus propter correctionem ad apostolos suos.

"Ecce ego mitto promissum patris mei in vobis, vos autem sedete in civitatem Hierusalem quoadusque induamini virtutem ab alto;" item, "Et accipietis virtutem supervenientem in vos sancto spiritu .... nec Deum nec Dominum sed ministrum Christi .... nec .... [sed] subditum et obœdientem in omnibus filio, et filium subditum et obœdientem in omnibus Deo patri." Here the MS. becomes illegible, and we are not informed by Ulfilas what were his opinions respecting the person of Christ. This deficiency is supplied by Auxentius, from whom it appears that he held "that there is only one unborn *(ingenitus)* God, who, not in order to divide his own Deity, but to shew forth his power and goodness, created the only born *(unigenitum)* Son, the second God, who has a higher God over him, God the Father. The whole creation is created by the Son; the Son himself created by the Father. Christ is neither equal nor similar to the Father; they are separate persons and have different wills (differentes adfectus). The Holy Spirit has not the title of God; he is created by the Father through the Son in the third degree, subordinate and obedient to the Father like the Son." "And as there is only one God, so there is only one church, one true communion of Christians; all the rest, Manichæans, Sabellians, Marcionists and Montanists, Novatians and Donatists, Photinians and Macedonians, Homousians and Homoiousians, are conventicles of Satan." Arianism alone, therefore, was true orthodoxy.

Whatever may be thought of his opinions, Ulfilas shewed at least his own confidence in them by enabling the Gothic nation to judge for themselves whether they were scriptural or not. All accounts agree in representing him as the means of introducing them to the knowledge of the Scriptures in their native tongue. And this involved another very important service—furnishing them with an alphabet. In ascribing to him this latter invention, friends and enemies, the Arian Philostorgius and the orthodox Socrates, agree. We are not to understand this as if he had devised a new set of characters for the use of his countrymen; it is evident from the comparison of the Mœso-gothic with the Greek and Latin alphabets that he had adapted the characters of the latter to his native language. And this could be done, from the radical affinity of the three languages which modern philology has brought to light, without the difficulty which is experienced in expressing the sounds of oriental languages in Greek or Roman letters. His alphabet is not that which, under the name of Runic, was possessed by the Gothic tribes on the Baltic, and the origin of which is still a mystery,

although four of the characters in his alphabet are identical with the Runic. It is the opinion of William Grimm, indeed, that the Goths had an alphabet before Ulfilas, though of a less perfect kind. Of this no sufficient proof has been produced, and if it were so, it would not be a fair ground for depriving Ulfilas of the glory which the ancient writers attribute to him. Mankind justly give the credit of a great invention to him who brings it to practical perfection, and gives it a permanent place among the instruments of civilization. And this it is clear that Ulfilas did for the Goths.

By the events of the fifth century the Goths were widely scattered over Europe. The Visigoths, after a short occupation of Italy, established themselves in the south of Gaul and in Spain, being finally dispossessed of the former by the Franks, and the latter by the Saracens. The Ostrogoths, towards the end of the century, established under Theodoric a short-lived monarchy in northern and central Italy. Wherever they went they carried with them, it is probable, not only the alphabet which they owed to Ulfilas, but his version of the Scriptures, as we know they did the Arian doctrine. Salvian, the bishop of Marseilles, in his Treatise de Gubernatione Dei (vii. 9—13) describes them as going to battle, carrying before them "librum divinæ legis, sacri voluminis scripta." In the midst of their sanguinary ravages they shewed themselves a "God-fearing people." Orosius, while he mourns over these ravages and considers them as a scourge of God, acknowledges that Rome suffered less from the Goths than it had done from Marius and Sylla, from Cæsar and Pompey, or Gaul and Spain from the conquest of the Romans.* Their morals, too, were purer in many respects than those of the people whom they conquered.

With the disappearance of the Gothic monarchies in Italy, France and Spain, we lose all trace of the version of Ulfilas, till, in the latter half of the sixteenth century, a MS. written on vellum, in silver letters with golden initials, was discovered in the Abbey of Werden, in Westphalia, containing portions of the four Gospels in a character and language which were evidently Gothic.† Such MSS. were among the luxuries of amateurs. "Habeant," says Jerome, quoted by Massmann, "qui volunt libros vel in membranis purpureis auro argentoque descriptos, dummodo mihi meisque permittant non tam pulcros quam emendatos codices habere." How this Codex Argenteus found its way to this place must be matter of conjecture; but as Westphalia was occupied by the Franks, one branch of whom bore the name of Westfali, it was probably part of the spoil made by a Frankish king in his wars upon the Goths. It is related by

* See the quotations in Massmann, Einleitung, p. xlv.

† This is now so generally admitted, that it would be useless to enter into the question, which Michaelis (Vol. II. p. 137) discusses at great length, whether the language is Gothic *or* Frankish.

Gregory of Tours* that Childebert, after such an expedition brought back, among other treasures, ". . . Evangeliorum capsas" of pure gold, adorned with precious stones, and gave them to various churches and basilicæ.† A MS. so precious as the Codex Argenteus may well have been kept in a golden case, and have been preserved when the gold went to the melting-pot. From Werden it was conveyed to Prague, where it fell into the hands of the Swedes when the city was stormed by Konigsmark in 1648, and was deposited in the library of Upsala. Soon after it is found in Holland in the possession of Isaac Vossius, who had spent much time at the court of Queen Christina. As this learned man does not bear the best reputation, and book-stealing has always been held a venial crime among collectors, he is suspected of having abstracted it from Upsala. It is hardly credible, however, that he would have ventured on a theft so sure to be speedily detected, and therefore the probability is that it had been presented to him by the Queen, whom he had taught Greek, and with whom he was a great favourite. While it was in the possession of Vossius it attracted the notice of Francis Junius, son of the Junius who, in conjunction with Tremellius, translated the Bible into Latin. He was the uncle of Isaac Vossius, and, having devoted himself to the study of the northern languages, recognized its value, and published an edition of it along with the Gospels in Anglo-Saxon, at Dordrecht, in 1665. The Swedish Chancellor, Count de la Gardie, purchased the Codex from Vossius, and restored it, bound in silver, to Queen Christina. Originally it appears to have consisted of 330 leaves, of which only 177 now remain, though in the middle of the last century there were 187. The ten missing leaves were cut out between 1821 and 1834. It now begins with Matt. v. 15, and ends with John xix. 8, and there are intervening lacunæ.

As the Codex Argenteus contained only the Gospels, doubts were entertained whether the labours of Ulfilas had not been exaggerated, when he was said by Philostorgius and Isidore to have translated the entire Scriptures. These doubts have since been in some measure removed. The library of Wolfenbüttel, in Brunswick, contains a MS. called the Codex Carolinus, in which the Origines of Isidore, of Seville, had been written over the version of Ulfilas in Gothic characters, accompanied by a Latin version in parallel columns. The vellum leaves, except four, had been used to cover other books before Knittel discovered their value. What remained and was decipherable contained only a few portions of the Epistle to the Romans. The Latin version appears to have been made in Italy in the

* See Michaelis, p. 146.

† Childebert's booty was obtained from the capture of Narbonne (A.D. 636), which would lead to the supposition of a Visigothic origin for the Codex Argenteus. On the other hand, the discovery of fragments of this version in Milan, Bobbio and other parts of Italy, seems to point to the Ostrogoths.

sixth century, where such a combination of two languages must have been common; a note at the end of the Brixen MS. of the Bible warning the reader "ne videatur aliud in Græca, aliud in Latina vel Gothica designata, esse conscripta."* Of course it is possible that the whole of the work may not have proceeded from Ulfilas, and the words of Walafrid Strabo point to different translators; "studiosi illius gentis divinos libros in suæ locutionis proprietatem transtulerunt." He wrote, however, in the ninth century, and unless some marked difference of style could be detected between the Evangelists and the other parts, it would be premature to call in question the evidence of contemporaries.

Additional portions of the Gothic version have since come to light. In 1817, the indefatigable Mai discovered at Milan, in palimpsest MSS. which had been brought from the monastery of Bobbio on the Trebia, nearly the whole of the Pauline Epistles, including the Epistle to the Romans. And as the portions of the Wolfenbüttel MS. agree with the text of this more recent discovery, the inference is that they belong to one and the same version. Other MSS. at Milan contain fragments of the Old Testament, which, scanty as they are, warrant the belief that all the canonical books, if not the Apocrypha, had been translated into Gothic. All these fragments, along with the Codex Argenteus, are included by Massmann in his edition; and he has added portions of a work in the Gothic language, derived from MSS. at Milan and Rome, which he calls *Skeireins*, or commentary, which appears to be a running commentary on the Gospel of John, designed in part to refute, from this Gospel, Sabellius, Marcellus and others, who held what the pure Arians considered heretical doctrines.† And as the passages commented upon correspond with the text of the Codex Argenteus, the presumption seems warranted that all the fragments hitherto discovered are parts of the "Authorized Version" of the Gothic nation, carried by them from the banks of the Danube wherever they were dispersed in their migration. No portion of the Catholic Epistles, the Epistle to the Hebrews or the Apocalypse, has yet been discovered. It would be unsafe, however, to draw any inference from this negative fact. Further discoveries may be in store for other Knittels and Mais. A remnant of the Gothic nation existed

* Massmann, p. lvii, quoting Blanchini Evang. Quadr., p. I.

† I quote from Massmann's translation the commentary on John v. 22, "The Father judgeth no man," &c.: "If therefore the Father and the Son were, as Sabellius argues, one and the same, signified by different names, how could the same person judge and not judge, for a change of names only does not make a change of persons; but the work is a proof that no one else judges, but that the Father has given the power of judgment to the Son, that all should honour the Son as they honour the Father. Let us, therefore, with such a plain declaration, give honour to the unborn God; and to the only born Son, who is God, not equal but similar honour. The Saviour himself, praying to the Father for his disciples, says, 'that Thou mayest love them as Thou lovest me;' not equal love but similar."

in the Crimea as late as the middle of the sixteenth century. Busbequius saw at Constantinople two delegates from them to the Sultan, and took down many of their words, which are evidently Gothic. They have disappeared since the Crimea became Russian; but an Armenian traveller in 1830 speaks of Gothic monuments and inscriptions still extant there, and it is not beyond hope that a portion of the Bible may have been carried thence to Russia.

A comparison of the recovered version of Ulfilas with the Greek, which Massmann has conveniently printed on the opposite page, fully confirms the opinion that he translated from the Greek and not from the Latin, a question once eagerly debated. Mill, finding that Ulfilas had many readings in common with the Codex Bezæ, which was then reputed to *Latinize*, was inclined to think that the Gothic version had been influenced by the Latin. There was indeed no reason why Ulfilas, who was master of the Latin as well as the Greek, should not have consulted Latin MSS., or why the Greek MSS. which he used should not have more or less affinity with the Latin; but that he translated from the Greek, not from the Latin, will, I think, be the conclusion of every one who compares his version with the Greek. It thus becomes a valuable aid to the critic towards ascertaining the reading of the Greek MSS. in the fourth century. His fidelity as a translator is unimpeachable. Michaelis observed that the passage in which an Arian translator would be most likely to betray his bias, Rom. ix. 5, did not occur in the fragment of the Epistle published by Knittel. It has since been found, and reads, "*saei ist ufar allaim guth thiuthiths in aivam*," "who is over all God blessed for ever." In 1 Tim. iii. 16, the rendering is, "*Jah unsahtaba* mikils ist gagudeins runa, saei gabairhtiths warth in leika*," &c., "And unquestionably great is godliness's mystery, which (or who) was brought to light in the flesh." This is the reading accepted by all recent critics, instead of "God was manifested in the flesh."

It is said by Philostorgius that Ulfilas translated the whole of the Bible except the books of Kings, which contained the wars of the Jewish people, and which he feared would stimulate the propensities of the Gothic nation, already too prone to war. To have been consistent, he should have also withheld from them the book of Joshua, which was quite as likely to be dangerous. Hitherto nothing has been found of the historical books subsequent to the Pentateuch except a fragment of Ezra and a considerable portion of Nehemiah.

* The root is *saka*, a cause, and specifically a legal cause. Hence our old legal phrase "sac and soke" for the right of holding courts. *Runa* is the word by which Ulfilas always translates μυστήριον. This may throw light on the primary use of Runes, as a secret character. The root of *gabairhtiths* is *bairht*, bright, whence the termination *bert* in so many Saxon names: Ethelbert (noble bright), Hildebert (hero bright), &c.

While Ulfilas was giving to his nation a treasure above all price in a translation of the Holy Scriptures, he was also bequeathing a most valuable legacy to all the branches of the Gothic family, in this record of their primitive language. Without it, it would have been impossible for Jakob Grimm to have traced the analogies which connect the various dialects which sprung from it, and demonstrated the original identity of the Scandinavian, Saxon, Anglo-saxon, and Teutonic in its various branches. And as we too have inherited a large portion of the word-treasure which the version of Ulfilas contains, we may devote a few lines to a comparison of his rendering with our modern English, using the German as a bridge over chasms that might be otherwise impassable. We take at random Mark xi. 28, foll.:

Goth. *Jah kuethun du imma In hwamma*
Eng. And quoth they to him in what (who, whom)
valdufnje thata
authority (Germ. *walt, gewalt;* A. Sax. *bretwalda)* that
taujis jah hwas thus thata valdufni atgaf ei
dost thou? and who thee that authority to-gave that
thata taujis.
that thou dost?

V. 29. *Ith Jesus andhafjands kuath du im Fraihna*
But Jesus answering quoth to them Ask (Germ. *frage)*
jah ik ainis vaurdis jah andhafjeth mis jah
also I one (ane) word and answer ye to me and
kuitha izvis in hwamma valdufnje thata tauja.
I will quoth to you in what authority that I do.

V. 30. *Daupeins Johannis uzuh*
Dipping (Germ. *taufen)* of John out of *(aus* Germ.)
himina vas thau uzuh mannam?
heaven *(himmel)* was or out of men?

The comparison will shew not only how close is the affinity between our mother tongue and that which was spoken by the converts of Ulfilas and the soldiers of Alaric, but also how much our language, and in a less degree the German, has been mutilated and impoverished by the loss of inflexions. The order of the words is so closely conformed to that of the Greek, as to prove that Ulfilas translated from the Greek and not from the Latin.

He is said to have been the author of many theological treatises which have perished; probably with no injury to his reputation, judging from the specimens which we have of the theology of that age. What time has spared is a sufficient title to our grateful remembrance.

K.

SCRIPTURAL HYMNS. By SIR JOHN BOWRING.

No. VII.

"Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof" (Matt. vi. 34).

AWAIT not with dismay
To-morrow's threatening things;
Sufficient to the day
The evil that it brings.

O take no anxious thought
If clouds of gloom prevail;
The past its blessings brought,
The future shall not fail.

Who feeds the fluttering birds,
Who paints the lily's cheeks,
In gracious smiles and words
To listening children speaks.

Sufficient to the day
The evil that it brings;
To-morrow's brighter ray
Has healing on its wings.

In God's paternal care
Find safety, comfort, rest;
Its bounties boundless are,
Its visitations blest.

No. VIII.

"Now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept" (1 Cor. xv. 20).

CHRIST is risen from the dead—he is risen;
First fruit of the sleeping is he;
He rose from death's desolate prison,
He hath made all his followers free!
He is risen—is risen! Our voices
To hail the great triumph unite;
While earth from its centre rejoices,
And heaven re-echoes delight.

He is risen—is risen! The tiding
From planet to planet afar
On the wings of the lightning is riding;
Star heralds the vict'ry to star.
Generation salutes generation
With the mighty, the magical word;
All space and all time shout "SALVATION!"
In the name of the conquering Lord.

THE STATE OF RELIGIOUS PARTIES AND OF UNITARIANISM.

THE state of religion in the United Kingdom at the present time can scarcely fail to excite great alarm and an apprehension of evil to come in every serious, religious and liberal mind. In Ireland, the healing measure of Catholic Emancipation (unhappily too long deferred) has, in a great degree, failed in producing that conciliation between Catholics and Protestants which its advocates had anticipated. Much as the general condition of that country has been improved, small progress appears to have been made in the cause of Christian charity, and the opposing parties (particularly the Romanists) have abated but little of their bigotry and virulence. In Scotland, the disputes between the Established and the Free Church are going on in no gentle spirit; and late events have shewn the narrowness and intolerance of the Scotch Church. The Church of England, which from its very large property, the exalted station of its Archbishops and Bishops, its connexion with the aristocracy, and its containing within its pale a very great majority of the higher and middle classes, exerts a most powerful influence on the general condition of the country, which extends indirectly to those who dissent from it, is harassed by the conflict of two large parties hostile to each other in principle and practice, and both of them far removed from the sentiments of the best educated and most intelligent of her sons. It would be uncandid and unjust in mentioning these two parties in the Church of England to omit saying that both of them are distinguished by active and Christian benevolence. The Evangelical or the Low-Church party, as it is now generally called, has always been energetic both in promulgating its peculiar doctrines and administering to the wants, physical and moral, of those who have needed its assistance; and the High-Church party has pursued a similar course. Both parties, however, are rejected as spiritual guides by a large majority of the thinking and intelligent members of the Church. Most of the clergy belong to one or other of these parties, or at least have a leaning towards them. Not a few, however, of the more intelligent clergymen of the Church of England are averse to both. Of them, the far larger part meddle but little with doctrines, but for the most part confine their sermons to that common Christianity which belongs to all parties. What that is we shall consider presently. A few of the middle class of the clergy (which has been absurdly called Broad Church) have adopted an extraordinary course by sending into the world various publications, in which, adopting the common language of what is called orthodoxy, and professing to believe the Thirty-nine Articles, they have explained the orthodox doctrine by forced and hitherto unheard-of interpretation of the terms in which they are expressed; and while in words they profess to be orthodox, it is

perfectly clear to every intelligent reader that these are so in name only. The Independents and the Baptists in general agree in doctrine with the Low-Church party, although many among the Independents appear to be making rapid advances towards what the Unitarians consider more just and scriptural views of religion. The Quakers appear to be much diminished in numbers, and indeed to be hastening to dissolution, although their leading principle (as we shall presently endeavour to shew) seems to be reviving in a quarter where it was little to be expected.

It is now time to consider how the state of religion, which has been slightly sketched, affects the Unitarians; whether it affords them opportunities of advancing those views which they believe to be derived from a sound and rational interpretation of the Scriptures, and what their conduct has been and ought to be in the circumstances in which they are placed. The High-Church party of the Church of England is made up of two sections—the old High-Church and the new, which is often designated by the terms Anglican, Puseyite and Tractarian. These last are distinguished by their introduction of many innovations in the ordinary service of the Church, all approaching more or less to the rites and ceremonies of the Roman Church. These are often called Romanizing tendencies. Several clergymen of this party have gone over to the Church of Rome, and not a few think that in consistency the rest ought to follow their example. Whether, however, Puseyism, or whatever it ought to be called, shall prove a transition state to Romanism, or whether it be destined to remain a branch of the Established Church, is a matter which but little concerns the view we have to take of the subject. The principle of Romanism and of the High party in the Established Church is precisely the same—that is, to set up priestly power, to give to the clergy spiritual authority, to make them regulators of the faith of the laity, to be, in short, what St. Peter declares they ought not to be, "lords over God's heritage." The peculiar doctrines of the Low-Church party and of what is often called the orthodox Dissenters, are mainly founded on what Unitarians believe to be a most erroneous interpretation of the Epistles of St. Paul, whose writings seem to have in a great measure superseded the other parts of the New Testament. Now we think that a great majority of the best educated and most intelligent members of the Church of England, and a considerable number of the so-called orthodox Dissenters, neither agree in the doctrine of the Low-Church nor admit the priestly claims of the High-Church party. What then are the religious opinions of these individuals? We have already said—the common Christianity of all Christians. They believe that the Almighty sent his Son Jesus Christ into the world to save sinners, and to give them assurance of future blessedness in the world to come by faith in him and obedience to God's holy will. There is no

doubt much diversity of opinion among this large class of persons on particular religious dogmas, and perhaps few, if any, have travelled so far as Unitarianism; but they may all be considered on the way to it, because Unitarianism rejects all which they reject, and is the only consistent scheme of religion which those who give up what are commonly called the orthodox doctrines can embrace. All middle schemes have faded away. We are not aware that any one now professes Arianism, in the proper meaning of the word; and as to what is sometimes improperly called Low Arianism—merely a belief in the pre-existence of Christ—it is only one phase of Unitarianism. But it may be fairly asked what proof we have to give that the state of religious opinion in the classes above referred to is what has been stated. We must confess that we have no distinct proof; but our conclusion is drawn from long and varied observation of the writings and conversation of the persons in question, which indirect mode of getting at people's real sentiments is often more satisfactory than direct assertions. Most persons are very slow in giving up the language in which they have been accustomed to express their religious opinions, although their sentiments have undergone considerable and important changes. The larger part, too, of the members of the Established Church are attached to it as a part of the institutions of the country, and believe, though they disapprove of much in it, that, on the whole, it is productive of great good; and being therefore unwilling to leave it, they cling as long as they can to its accustomed forms, and are unwilling to forego the use of its language. This will be easily understood by very many reflecting Unitarians, who think that, notwithstanding the very great doctrinal errors of the Established Church, its destruction would lead to evils far greater than those which now exist in the religious world. Judging by present appearances, the Unitarians have far more to hope from the liberal members of the Established Church than from any class of Dissenters.

Let us now turn our attention to the state of things in the Unitarian body, and consider whether any impediments exist to their advancing and extending in the world those views of Christianity which they believe to be consonant with reason and scripture, and for the promotion of which the existing state of religious opinions has appeared to us so favourable. It cannot be denied that much remained to be done within the body itself in the way of correcting errors, and giving greater spirituality to Unitarianism. Few candid persons among us will now deny that the charge formerly brought against Unitarianism of being "the frozen zone of Christianity," was not wholly without foundation. That the charge was exaggerated, and that much which is truly pious and spiritual is to be found in the writings of the older Unitarians, must be admitted; but that, for the most part,

they were deficient in depth of feeling and elevation of sentiment, in the earnestness which speaks to the heart and the tenderness which engages the affections, a candid estimate of their writings will, we think, compel most of those who read them to admit. To purify, to elevate and to spiritualize Unitarianism, and by so doing to bring it nearer to the precepts and the example of the Saviour and his apostles, is a work worthy of the strongest heads and the most feeling hearts to be found among its professors. But that the differences between Unitarianism and what is called Orthodoxy should ever have been deemed otherwise than of the highest importance, is what could hardly have been anticipated so late as twenty years ago. Yet, judging from the writings of many Unitarians, the doctrinal differences between the Unitarians and the orthodox seem to be considered of far less importance than they were deemed to be by our predecessors. The word Unitarian has been repeatedly objected to as a designation of a section of the Christian church, although no other term has been suggested to distinguish those who, rejecting the doctrine of the Trinity, address their prayers to the Creator only as their God and Father; and deny that there is any scriptural authority for the doctrines of original sin, the death of Christ being a satisfaction to Divine justice, and the imputation of the righteousness of Christ to sinners. Surely these are dogmas which admit of no compromise. One or the other side must be taken by all thinking and faithful men; and a name is required to mark the difference. No denomination has yet been suggested so well fitted to express these differences of religious doctrine as Unitarianism.

But according to the tenor of the writings of many, doctrines of any kind seem to be considered as matters of comparatively inferior importance. Freedom of inquiry, anti-sectarianism, a rejection of creeds, progress and development, are mainly to be considered. These are the idols set up in high places which are to put aside, or at least to treat as inferior matters, such questions as engaged the attention and called forth the energies of the earlier Unitarians; such as whether the Deity has predestinated a large portion of the creatures whom he has made to eternal perdition, or whether he is good unto every man, and his tender mercies are over all his works.

Let us examine these favourite words which are so frequently bandied about among us, and see whether they afford us any ground for weakening our attachment to the doctrines held by the Unitarians, and to lessen, in any degree, our sense of their importance.

As to free inquiry, it does not seem necessary to trouble ourselves much about it in an age when it is fully established. It is no doubt right to recommend to all to make use of the faculties which God has given them on the most important of all subjects,

but nothing more seems to remain to be done. There is nothing in this country to prevent free inquiry being carried on to any extent. Not only are publications denying the truth of the Christian religion sent into the world without any risk of persecution being incurred by their authors, but a few years ago a joint work professedly atheistical was published, and we have never heard that either of the individuals who wrote it have been in any way persecuted or molested on account of this publication. There appears, then, to be nothing in the existing state of things in this country to cause reasonable alarm for the cause of free inquiry. We cannot, however, help asking the question, Is this really an age of free inquiry? and truth compels us to say that if by free inquiry is to be understood a careful collection of facts and an impartial weighing of arguments, this is not an age of free inquiry. The character of most of the religious speculations of the times seems to us to be to select some favourite notion, sentiment or feeling, and to form opinions in accordance with the pre-conceived feeling or sentiment. We cannot doubt that the 18th century, much decried as it is by writers of a certain class, had far more of free inquiry in religion than the 19th.

The next exhortation which we have the benefit of receiving from the writers in question is not to be sectarian. Anti-sectarianism seems to be far more important than the adhering to any doctrine. Here the ambiguity of language must be considered. To be sectarian in one sense is always blameable; to be so in another is the necessary result of the position in which an honest man finds himself. If by sectarianism we are to understand laying an undue stress on those matters in which we differ with other classes of Christians, and, still worse, thinking uncharitably of others and behaving unjustly or unkindly to them on account of a difference of opinion, it deserves to be severely condemned; but if by sectarianism we are to understand adhering to the class of religionists with whom we are most nearly agreed, it is precisely what every conscientious man feels himself bound to do, and not to do which would render him liable to just reproach.

To have a creed, it seems, is severely to be blamed. Yet what is a creed but the summary of what a man believes? If any one should, from dislike to the word creed, rather call this summary belief, we have no objection; but by whatever name it may be called, no man who has any religion at all can be without it. No form of nonsense can be more free from any mixture of common sense than talking of a religion which has no belief. Creeds are in themselves innocent things, and only become noxious when we attempt to force them on others.

And now we come to the favourite words Development and Progress; both, like the word Sectarianism, may be explained in a good or an evil sense. By development, we presume is under-

stood the unfolding of the powers of the human mind and of the revealed will of God; and by progress, the formation of opinions which is the result of this development. No man, we trust, will be found so absurd and so arrogant as to pretend to limit the operations of the human mind, and to say, "Thus far thou shalt go and no further." When we regard the wonderful discoveries and inventions of our own days, we may well think it probable that future ages will be benefited by inventions and discoveries of which we have not the faintest anticipation. That the Holy Scriptures contain stores of religious wisdom which have never yet been duly appreciated or fully understood,—and that we cannot employ our time better than in endeavouring to attain a fuller knowledge of the Bible, particularly of the New Testament, and to realize more and more spiritually and fervently its divine spirit,—all must admit. We fear, however, that the prevailing sentiment of not a few among us is, that Christianity as taught by Christ and his apostles is incomplete; and that it is to be carried further, and enlarged by the powers of the human mind and conscience, or what we believe (for we are not skilled in the hazy language of the day applied to these subjects) is called moral consciousness. We may be mistaken in this matter; and, if so, shall be grateful to any one who will correct our error. If, however, any one should be found who thinks himself capable of giving us an improved Christianity, we cannot help regarding him as having fallen into a most dangerous error. To us, Jesus Christ is "the same yesterday, to-day and for ever;" and we cannot forget the denunciation of St. Paul against those who should presume to add anything to the gospel which he taught.

The progress of which so much has been said is to our minds in some degree a misnomer, and the term regress is more properly applicable to certain recent speculations. These have tended not to strengthen, but to weaken, the cause of Christianity by taking away some of its important bulwarks. This remark particularly applies to what has been written on the subject of the miracles recorded in the New Testament. These have hitherto been regarded as most important evidences, indeed as the very substance of the historical evidence, of the truth of Christianity. Nobody appears to deny that He who constituted the laws of nature has the power to suspend them; nor does it seem now to be asserted by any Christian that the fact of miracles being worked cannot be proved by human testimony. No satisfactory argument has been adduced to shew that miracles can be wrought by any being but the Almighty. Whenever, then, we are satisfied that a miracle has been *wrought*, or rather *declared*, by a human being, we conclude that God wrought it and authorized man to declare it. From the moment that the question presented itself to the human mind, whether miracles had been wrought in attestation of a divine revelation, it seems

natural to expect that every serious and religious mind would direct its closest attention to the subject, and would not rest satisfied till it had come to a decided conviction as to the truth or falsehood of the assumed miraculous fact. It has been reserved to our own times to leave the question of miracles in doubt, and to form an opinion that the truth of the Christian religion may be established without the aid of the evidence of miracles, and therefore it was immaterial whether or not they were believed; and it is broadly asserted in a letter signed S. S. in the Christian Reformer for September, that "the miracles in the Bible are generally acknowledged to be a cause of difficulty rather than any help to our faith." Miracles no help to our faith! A reference to one single miracle will be a sufficient answer to this strange assertion. Let any reasonable man ask himself whether, if he had been living in Judea in the time of our Saviour,—had heard his discourses and his prediction of his resurrection from the dead,—had afterwards seen him crucified, dead and buried,—and had on the third day seen him risen from the dead,—and had conversed with him, and touched and handled him,—he would not have considered his resurrection as a sufficient and irresistible ground for faith in his divine mission? Such it has always been deemed till our own times; nor are we aware that even now any one has expressly denied it.

We have no hesitation in saying that the rejection of the miraculous part of the gospel narratives ought to draw after it a rejection of the whole history contained in them and in the book of the Acts of the Apostles, and thus to destroy the whole body of historical evidence of the truth of our religion. No one has shewn the possibility of separating the miraculous from the ordinary facts of the gospel history; and there is no plausible ground for thinking that the accounts of the miracles were not written by the same persons who wrote the rest of these narratives. Now as to some at least of these miracles the beholders could not be deceived. *Possibly* in some instances the healing of diseases might be brought about by natural means, and *possibly* the widow's son at Nain might have been merely in a trance and not dead. These suppositions are indeed highly improbable. With respect, however, to many of the recorded miracles, such as the miraculous feeding of many thousands and the resurrection of Jesus, the apostles could not possibly have been deceived. Of this last event, the most important which has occurred in the annals of the human race, we are told by the apostles themselves that they were the appointed witnesses. All Christians—at least an enormous majority—are agreed that two of the Gospels were written by apostles, and the other two by friends of the apostles well acquainted with the facts of which they give an account. If, then, they have asserted that certain miracles, of such a nature as they could not be deceived as to their miraculous character,

had been wrought, when no such events had actually taken place, the inevitable consequence is that they wilfully promulgated falsehoods. But if they did so in some cases, can they possibly be trusted in others? If they stand before the world as liars (we tremble while we write the word) in some things, how can they be trusted in other parts of their narratives? Surely the conclusion of every rational mind must be, let no such men be trusted. The remarks just made apply equally to the book of the Acts of the Apostles, and thus the rejection of the New-Testament history deprives us of all historical evidence of the truth of the Christian religion, except the slight reference to it in the writings of the Latin historians.

But here some of the more advanced thinkers of the new school may turn round upon us and say, "We care not at all for external evidence; we are satisfied with the light within, which teaches us that Christianity is from God; and our desire and our delight is, in the language of the apostle Paul, to put on Christ, to live in his spirit, to regulate our lives by his precepts." Excellent resolutions, and fervently do we wish that God may prosper those who make them. On this part of our subject we feel ourselves on uncertain ground, and are by no means sure that we may not have misunderstood, and thus unintentionally misrepresented, the sentiments of those to whom we are opposed. Gladly should we find this to be the case. This paper will not be written in vain if it shall elicit a distinct statement from some of those who reject or doubt the truth of the Christian miracles, of their views of the historical details of the New Testament. If some (as it seems to us) ground their belief in the truth of the Christian religion solely on internal feeling, impressions, sentiments, consciousness, or by whatever name it may be called, independent of any external historical evidence, this seems in no respect to differ from the new light of the earlier Quakers, and is open to the following objections.

In the first place, how do we know that these internal feelings or impressions are infallibly true? Thousands of the professors of other religions, Mahometans, Hindoos, Buddhists, &c., have all impressions of their own different from ours, and hold them with equal confidence. How are we to satisfy ourselves that the spiritual light which was withheld from Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato and Aristotle, has been given to us? But admitting that we have attained an infallible assurance of the truth of our own views of religion, we have still no possible means of giving proof to others of the soundness of our belief; and, for the great majority of Christians, the historical evidence afforded by the New Testament is the ground of belief. A man may be fully satisfied that he has in his own mind an infallible guide to religious truth, but he can have no means of making another believe that his views are more accurate than those of others who hold different

opinions. If, then, we are to discard the historical evidence, every man must be left to do the best he can for himself in forming his religious opinions without any external aid,—a state of things which the most intrepid thinker would scarcely think desirable. To come to the point to which these observations tend. Such opinions as we have referred to being current among Unitarians, although probably confined to a small number of them, cannot, we think, fail to add greatly to the unpopularity which attaches to their name, and to the misapprehension which very generally exists as to their opinions.

But there is another circumstance strongly tending to prevent the advancement of Unitarianism. Instead of a steady and undeviating profession of attachment to its principles, many of us seem to be ashamed of its name, and to be desirous of changing it, although no other designation has been suggested indicative of the most important differences between us and the so-called orthodox. It is to be feared that we are fast verging to a sort of generalized Christianity, which defines nothing, settles nothing, and appears to regard any one set of opinions to be as good as another. We seem afraid to call ourselves Unitarians, lest at some future period juster views of Christian doctrine should arise. What, then, is this Unitarianism which we fear may become obsolete? We refer here more particularly to the Object of religious worship, for a reason which will shortly appear. The Trinitarian addresses his prayers to God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Ghost, and the Trinity in Unity. The Unitarian prays to God alone and as the Father, as he is often called in the New Testament. He does not find that the Son of God is ever called God the Son in the New Testament, or that prayers are ever addressed to him as God; nor are there in that same book the words God the Holy Ghost or Trinity. Do the friends of Progress really look to the time when scriptural authority shall be found for these doctrines? and, if not, why are they afraid or ashamed to call themselves Unitarians? We are perfectly satisfied that it is not on account of its unpopularity that they shrink from the use of the name Unitarian.

Unitarianism being distinguished from all the other divisions of the Christian world, it seems in the highest degree desirable that it should stand forth as a distinct church, a section of the church of Christ, which embraces all Christians. Holding these sentiments, it was with great pain that we read the following passage from a letter of Mr. Martineau published in the *Inquirer* and re-published in the October number of the *Christian Reformer:* "To a Unitarian *Society*,—just as to a Reform Society,—I would willingly belong, but of a 'Unitarian Church' I could never be a member." Now if Mr. Martineau could not be a "member," it should seem that, *a fortiori*, he could not be a minister of a "Unitarian church." It is, however, well known

that he has lately become, with his excellent friend and colleague Mr. Tayler, joint minister of the Portland-Street congregation, which was established by the late Mr. Agar as a Unitarian congregation, and which cannot be regarded as an offshoot of the old Presbyterian stock. Are we then to conclude that Portland-Street is no longer a Unitarian church? We have nothing to do with any arrangements which have taken place between Mr. Martineau and his congregation, and we have asked the question above merely because we think the words quoted are not to be interpreted in what appears to be their meaning. Taking them in their ordinary signification, we should conclude that the respected minister of Portland-Street chapel was not precluded from prayers and sermons inconsistent with Unitarianism,—that he might use a Trinitarian prayer or preach a Trinitarian sermon. This we cannot believe to be his meaning; and we should gladly and gratefully receive such an explanation as would shew that Mr. Martineau's words were intended to express something different from what they seem to us to import. We are encouraged to believe that such explanation may be given, because in the early part of the same letter it is admitted that every church must agree in some things which form a bond of union among them.

We cannot but deeply regret the state of things among the Unitarians, believing that infidelity is making rapid advances among the educated classes of the country; that Unitarianism alone affords a chance of stopping its progress; and that the rejection of the miraculous part of the Gospels and indifference to religious doctrines are fitted to do incalculable injury to Unitarianism and to Christianity. L.

POSTSCRIPT BY THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

As the letter of our respected correspondent "L." (to whom the readers of this Magazine have been indebted on more occasions than one for sound and liberal counsel) was written before Mr. Martineau's "Second Letter," designed to explain the first, had come into his hands, we think it just to Mr. Martineau to quote one or two passages which intimate that he is a believer in the doctrine of the Divine Unity, however strongly he dislikes the name "Unitarian," and whatever may be his estimate of Unitarian literature, plans of organization, &c. &c. "I did not dream of 'disparaging' the doctrine of the Divine Unity, in which I myself believe," &c. (p. 22). "I have never expressed disapproval of the *individual* 'fixing his creed.'.... My protest is against *a church* fixing its creed..... I know well that to believe a thing true is to believe it immutable; that earnest conviction naturally excludes all suspicion of possible change, and carries in it a confidence of spreading to other minds, and attaining universal recognition. Within the limits of his proper rights, I would have every man surrender himself freely to these impressions, utter them, and act upon them" (p. 27). On the relative importance of the doctrine of the Divine Unity and of some other Christian truths, our views and Mr. Martineau's have, we fear, little in common.

THE ULSTER REVIVAL OF 1859.

FROM the subjoined list of publications,*—though it embraces none but those which have emanated from evangelical sources, and even of them includes but a selection,—it will be seen that a great deal has been printed on the subject of the "Revival movement" which, during the last summer and autumn, went

* 1. Revivals in Ireland: Facts, Documents and Correspondence. By James William Massie, D.D., LL.D., Secretary to the Irish Evangelical Society. London—Snow. Pp. 68, 8vo.

2. History and Prominent Characteristics of the present Revival in Ballymena and its Neighbourhood. By the Rev. S. J. Moore, of Ballymena. Belfast. Pp. 36, 12mo.

3. The Revival at Ahoghill; its Narrative and Nature. By the Rev. D. Adams, Ahoghill. Belfast. Pp. 30, 8vo.

4. The Revival Movement in Lisburn: the "Strikings-down" and the "Marks" vindicated, as the Pure and Genuine Work of the Lord. By Alex. M'Cann. Belfast. Pp. 64, 8vo.

5. Revivalism: Is it of God or of the Devil? With Observations on the "Sleeping Cases." (3rd Thousand.) Belfast. Pp. 8, 8vo.

6. The Revival: a Weekly Record of Events connected with the present Revival of Religion. London—Morgan and Chase. (Each No. contains 8 pages, sm. 4to.)

7. Thoughts on the Revival of 1859: a Sermon. By the Rev. James Morgan, D.D. Belfast. Pp. 12, 8vo.

8. Brief Narrative of a Visit to the North of Ireland during the Awakening. By H. C. Binns. London. Pp. 15, 12mo.

9. Bodily Effects of Religious Excitement. (Reprinted from the Princeton Review.) Armagh. Pp. 23, 12mo.

10. Revivalism Reviewed. By the Rev. W. M'Ilwaine, A.M., Incumbent of St. George's Church, Belfast. Pp. 16, 8vo.

11. The Work and Counter-work: or the Religious Revival in Belfast; with an Explanation of the Physical Phenomena. By Edward A. Stopford, Archdeacon of Meath. Dublin. Pp. 92, 8vo.

12. The Evidences of the Work of the Holy Spirit: a Sermon, preached in St. Stephen's Church, Dublin. By George Salmon, D.D., F.T.C.D. With an Appendix. Dublin. Pp. 57, 8vo.

13. God's Work and Satan's Counter-works: a Sermon, preached in Killileagh Church. By the Rev. Edward Hincks, D.D. (2nd Ed.) Belfast. Pp. 16, 8vo.

14. The Ulster Revival; a Paper read before the Evangelical Alliance, Sept. 1859. By the Rev. Charles Seaver, Incumbent of St. John's, Belfast. Pp. 20, 8vo.

15. The Ulster Revival and its Physiological Accidents; a Paper read before the Evangelical Alliance, Sept. 1859. By the Rev. James M'Cosh, LL.D., Author of the Method of the Divine Government. Belfast. Pp. 15, 8vo.

16. Revivals:—"Covet earnestly the Best Gifts:" a Sermon, preached in Portadown Church. By Henry Bryan Carter, Curate of Clon-feacle. Belfast. Pp. 12, 12mo.

17. Words of Caution and Counsel on the present Religious Revival. By Thomas M'Neece, D.D., Rector of Arboe, &c. &c. Dublin. Pp. 23, 8vo.

18. Revivalism. By the Rev. Jer. Bowen, B.A. London—Rivingtons. Pp. 22, 8vo.

19. Another Stone in the Temple. Belfast. Pp. 4, 8vo.

20. An Impartial View of the Revival in Ireland. By the Rev. Francis King, A.B., Chaplain of St. Patrick's, Newry. Pp. 52, 12mo.

21. Person and Work of the Holy Spirit: a Discourse delivered to the (Calvinistic) Presbyterian Congregation, Donegall Street, Belfast. By the Rev. Isaac Nelson. Pp. 36, 8vo.

[It would be endless to enumerate the lectures, letters and discussions, which appeared in the local newspapers, magazines and reviews, during the prevalence of the agitation; but many of them contained useful, well-authenticated and very significant statements.]

on so briskly in the counties of Antrim, Down, Armagh and Londonderry. Yet it is evident that in many quarters its real nature is as yet imperfectly understood. Judging from the statements which meet us in conversation, correspondence, and the proceedings of our religious societies, it would seem that misapprehension on this subject exists quite as widely among Unitarians as in any other denomination. Some of our friends to the eastward of the Irish Channel appear to have engaged in the pursuit of this spiritual bubble, after it had already burst. They have taken under their patronage a discredited and already ruined cause, when its early patrons and friends have grown heartily ashamed of it, and when the original propagators of the delusion,—many of whom, however, were themselves deluded,—are seeking, in silence and obscurity, a shelter from the shame which they have drawn down upon themselves. They come forward to enrol themselves under the banner of Revivalism, at a time when nothing but ridicule is to be gained by enlisting in the ragged regiment. The facility with which this moral epidemic has been hailed, by so many amongst us, as a sound and healthy action of the Spirit of God, seems to us another of the many facts which shew that the successors of Priestley, Lindsey and Belsham, whatever progress they may be supposed to have made in other directions, have not improved on the sober judgment, the penetrating sagacity and logical clearness of mind, by which those eminent men were distinguished. What is to become of Unitarianism, if those who are so easily made the dupes of transparent fallacies are to be henceforth its representatives and champions! The readiness with which the delusion has been welcomed as a truth of the most solemn and interesting kind, will excuse us for handling this topic at much greater length than its intrinsic importance would at all justify, though still very briefly, in reference to the abundance of the materials at hand.

Various accounts have been given of the beginning of the movement. The Rev. W. D. Corken, "Agent of the Irish Evangelical Society at Carrickfergus," traces it to the labours of an English lady, who visited the north of Ireland about two years ago, and succeeded in "converting" an elderly person "named M'——, and his wife," in the neighbourhood of Ballymena, from whom the influence spread. "Will not this circumstance," he asks, "gladden the hearts of our English ladies and all our dear friends in the Congregational churches of England? Will it not draw out their deepest sympathies towards us in Ireland? Will they not pray for us more fervently, *and aid our mission still more zealously?*" (*Massie*, p. 1.) The Rev. S. J. Moore, of Ballymena, states that the revival began with a society consisting of four young men, who met, for prayer and mutual exhortation, in a little school-house near the village of Connor, "two of

whom had lately removed thither from Ballymena," (having been apparently members of his own congregation,) "where they had seen themselves and been found by their Saviour." "The special object of their society was prayer that God would bless the preaching of the gospel in the Connor congregation, and their own labours, and those of others, in connection with the prayer-meetings and sabbath-schools throughout the district. . . . . The first observable instance of conversion occurred in December following. A young man became greatly alarmed. After some time, in answer to earnest prayer by himself and others, he found peace and confidence." (These, it may be here remarked, are universally the objects aimed at by those who labour for a revival: *first* to alarm the mind with the terrors of damnation, and *then* to bring it into a state in which it feels no farther uneasiness,—nothing but peace, confidence and a full assurance of salvation. When this is done, the end is accomplished.) Soon others experienced a similar process. "Special prayer was frequently offered in the fellowship-meeting on behalf of two persons," (seemingly in their presence,) "who, some three months afterwards, joyfully professed their faith in the Lord Jesus." The movement spread. "In the beginning of this year a convert from Connor visited his friends near Ahoghill, and through his urgency and prayers the Holy Spirit awakened nearly all the family to a deep sense of their sins: these became missionaries to their neighbours and friends; and about the middle of February, hundreds through the parishes of Drummaul and Ahoghill were overwhelmed with convictions of sin, its dangers and demerits; and during the month of March, in private houses, and barns, and school-houses, and churches, prayer-meetings were conducted and addressed by recent converts, attended by multitudes in the houses and around them." (*Moore*, pp. 2—4.) The Rev. Mr. Adams, the minister of Ahoghill, is not disposed to admit the claim of Connor, (*or of Ballymena vid Connor,*) to the merit of having set the revival on foot. He says, "The present extraordinary religious movement in the north of Ireland began in the south-west part of the parish of Ahoghill, in the county of Antrim, about the commencement of the present year, 1859. . . . . For a considerable period previously there was here, as at other places, a slow, silent work of salvation progressing satisfactorily. Some would call this a revival, and so it was in a sense. But the torrent-flood of God's mercy did not come till the early part of this year, and then *it was first manifested at Ahoghill.* While I admit the existence of some prayer-meetings elsewhere, I deny that they were the beginning of the revival, properly speaking." (*Adams*, p. 1.) The Rev. J. Bain, unwilling to deprive any of the localities or agents of the credit which they are so anxious to assert for themselves, inclines to compromise the question of their re-

spective claims, by expressing his belief that the revival, "like a mighty stream, has arisen from a number of springs, concealed, it may be, in the bosom of the mountains of Antrim, where for a season they continued to gush forth, seen only by a few, until now they have met in the valleys, and are pouring their floods upon the churches, sweeping sin and cold-hearted formalism before them. That the work is the Lord's I have *now* no reason to doubt." (*Massie*, pp. 2, 3.) It would seem that at first he doubted.

But wherever the movement may have originated, the means by which it was propagated admit of no doubt. In Ballymena, Ballymoney, Antrim, Coleraine, Belfast, Lisburn, Lurgan, Dromore, and other places into which it was desired to spread the contagion, the first step was usually made by ministers—Calvinistic, Methodist and Episcopalian—who were favourable to the agitation, announcing to their people the wonderful outpouring of the Spirit which had taken place in the localities previously affected. Prayers were frequently and urgently offered up in the houses of worship for a similar manifestation of the power of God in the neighbourhood; the people were exhorted to pray for it in their homes and families; and prayer-meetings were instituted in which the supplication might be reiterated from the whole district simultaneously. On all these occasions, the terrors of the Lord were denounced, not always vociferously, but in most cases with the most terrific imagery and "undisguised simplicity." The ground being thus prepared, "converts" from other places already "smitten" were introduced; sometimes they were sent for, at other times they came uninvited. They narrated the history of their own cases; the terrors they had experienced when first awakened; the agonizing prayers they had sent forth; the conflict through which they had passed; the gradual or rapid clearing away of the gloom from their souls; and the delight and joy with which they had at last been enabled to feel that their sinfulness was "washed away in the blood of Emmanuel," and that their final salvation was "sealed and sure." (*Massie* and the *Revival newspaper*, passim.) Some of these converts did not hesitate to acknowledge that, till a few months or weeks before the time when they stood forth as the messengers of Jesus to perishing sinners, they had been leading the most immoral and profligate lives. One of the two who were first invited from the neighbourhood of Ballymena to further the work of revival in Belfast, stated, rather by way of ostentation than of confession, that he was not long emerged from jail, to which he had been sentenced, not for the first time, for offences against the law. He made this part of his history the foundation of an appeal to his auditors. "If I, notwithstanding all my crimes, have so readily found peace and comfort, surely none of you need despair; *only believe!*" It would be extraordinary if among a multitude

of persons, already wrought up to a high pitch of excitement, and in many cases reduced to a state of spiritual anguish by the preparatory discipline to which they had been subjected, there were not found several disposed to accept the easy terms. Many, no doubt, thought themselves entitled to claim the sweet privilege of being among the ransomed. Others, there is too much reason to believe, were not even imposed upon by their own enthusiasm, but simply imitated what they saw others do and say, determined not to be left behind in the race, and willing to have a share in the notoriety, the distinction and the general interest which they saw lavished on their friends and neighbours who professed to have undergone the life-giving change.

It is always preceded by "an agonizing sense of sin. The parties affected feel that sin is a hell-kindling, soul-destroying, God-hating thing; they not only dread the wrath and curse of an offended God, as exposing them to everlasting torment, but experience in many cases a godly sorrow for their offences against the holy and good Jehovah, especially in neglecting and rejecting the well-beloved Son, 'having trodden under foot the Son of God, and counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified *(sic)* an unholy thing, and hath done despite to the spirit of grace.' The conscience thus afraid by the remembrance of past sins, and the devil assaulting them with great violence, going about to overwhelm them with heaps, seas of sins, we often see the perspiration, bead-like, streaming from the brow, the body trembling as in an ague fever, the hands clasped with convulsive energy and raised to heaven. .... The soul begins to live as it utters the now well-known and common cry, 'God be merciful to me, a sinner.'" *(Adams,* p. 13.) To the same effect says another ardent friend of the revival: "The soul is felt to be guilty and lost. Sin is seen to be loathsome and deadly, and it is generally felt to be an intolerable burthen, crushing the body and soul to hell. Horror unutterable overwhelms the heart, especially of those who feel that the devil is persuading or dragging them to perdition. With some, this conviction has reference to particular easily besetting sins; with others, the greater number, to the general sinful state of the soul. In almost all the unregenerate, it produces an intense fear, an awful agonizing horror of eternal condemnation. .... The subjects of conviction are of all ages, from five to seventy years; but the great majority are young. Some are frequently convicted, though they do not return to their old ways, perhaps to intensify the work. Conviction and sinning alternate with some; and ultimately the convictions seem, *in the mean time,* to triumph." *(Moore,* pp. 9, 10.) This part of the process is obviously grounded on the most intense doctrines of Calvinism,—an offended God, an ever-active devil, an eternal hell. Remorse is felt not merely for besetting sins, but for "the *general* sinful state of the soul,"—which, we are

sure we do Mr. Moore no injustice in affirming, means, in his mouth, its sinfulness by nature derived from the original corruption of the whole race of man in Adam. How else could these horrors overwhelm the minds of *children of five years old?* It is well that all of us should understand what is the real significance of the movement which so many are anxious to applaud, if not to recommend for imitation.

Mr. Moore states that the great majority of the convicts are young. In the earlier stages of life, that is, among the children, the proportion of the two sexes who are (or were) thus affected is nearly equal; perhaps the number of little girls who "feel conviction" is rather greater than that of young boys of the same age. In advancing life, the females decidedly preponderate. Not many youths "experience conviction" after the age of fifteen years, and scarcely any men after two-and-twenty; but women of all ages are smitten. "They" (the converts) "have been universally of one class—the ignorant, uneducated, hard-worked and easily-impressed class; and, in the proportion of nineteen out of every twenty, young and excitable females. When I say universally, I do so deliberately, for the exceptions are not worth taking into account. I have known of some in the upper class who, in the reign of the excitement, went about even desiring to be 'struck,' and failed; and just one individual approaching to the class of educated has come within my knowledge in Belfast." (*M'Ilwaine*, p. 9.) We have heard of a few cases in which some went through the whole or part of the revival process who had received a moderately good education; but in all the instances of this kind of which we have heard, conviction was followed by the suspension or the loss of reason; in several, by the loss of life. But we must not anticipate.

Our readers can hardly fail to have remarked the *naïveté* with which Mr. Moore announces that "*some are frequently convicted, though they do not return to their old ways.*" He does not tell, what however is an undoubted fact, that this agonizing anguish has been experienced by some of the convicts as often as once every second or third day, and in some cases as often as once a day, for weeks together. With our profane carnal philosophy, we can account for these things very easily on natural principles; but if they are the work immediately of the Holy Spirit, (an Omnipotent agent,) it does seem strange that it should require to be repeated so often.

Our brethren whose heads are filled with the fancies of anti-sectarianism, and who, at the same time, have been strongly attracted towards the Revival movement, will doubtless be grateful to us for informing them that it has, from first to last, been characterized by a bitter spirit of intolerance towards all forms of faith different from that which is professed in the communities to which the revivalists and the converts belong. The Editor

of the *Coleraine Chronicle*,—who is a very ardent friend of the movement, and who gives, as an evidence of its power, the pleasing fact that on one occasion he had applications for several hundred copies of his paper more than he was able to supply, (*Massie*, p. 12,) says, "The most tangible proof of the genuineness of this work is to be found in its remarkable results, as evidenced in the disappearance of vice, the prevalence of a high-toned morality, and the conversion of *Roman Catholics, Unitarians and other errorists. . . . Arians have joined Trinitarian churches, and Roman Catholics have burned their prayer-books and become Protestants*, in spite of the virtues of holy water and wine." (*Massie*, p. 4.) At Ballymena, a poor woman "was urged by some of her fellow-converts *to follow their example* and burn her 'Manual' of the Roman Catholic faith. 'No,' she replied, 'I will not do that, for it contains some portions of the Word of God, *but I will bury it in the earth.*'" (*Massie*, p. 19.) Similar indications of an anti-catholic spirit will meet the reader of the first half-dozen pamphlets in our list. But these can give but a faint idea of the savage ferocity with which the doctrines, the clergy and the rites of the Romish Church were inveighed against in many of the revival prayer-meetings. Still it may be inferred that a system which inculcated as an act pleasing to God, that of burning the prayer-books and other works of Roman Catholic devotion, cannot claim much credit for anti-sectarianism, and could scarcely be said to aim at the preservation of the public peace in neighbourhoods in which there is a large infusion of Roman Catholicism in the population. And this reminds us of the language uttered by one of the speakers at the recent meeting of the London District Unitarian Society. He said that on the 12th of July, "the whole of the vast assembly" were animated by a spirit of love to all mankind, which it was truly delightful to witness. We can inform this gentleman that on the 12th of July, 1859, there were just two "vast assemblages" held in the north of Ireland,—one at Ballymena, and one on the race-course, called the Maze, near the town of Lisburn. Both were convened nominally as Revival meetings; and that at Ballymena appears to have been conducted in a perfectly inoffensive manner. But the Maze meeting was attended by a great number of Orange lodges, with flags, sashes and other insignia, which marched to the ground in bodies, with drums and fifes playing party tunes; and, in several instances, the persons composing the procession uttered most insulting expressions toward their Roman Catholic fellow-citizens. Several were equipped with fire-arms, which they discharged from time to time, not only while going to and returning from the meeting, but during its continuance; so that it is due to the forbearance of others, and no merit of theirs, that the day did not close with riot and bloodshed. Such proceedings, we need scarcely add, are themselves, by the Act for sup-

pressing party processions and demonstrations, a breach of the public peace.

Not a whit less intolerant towards every shade and form of *Unitarianism* were the leaders of the Revival movement. In a few instances, persons professing Unitarian opinions were caught by the epidemic frensy. Some were terrified by the awful denunciations which they heard from the pulpit, when, from motives of curiosity, they had gone to see and hear what was making such a noise in the surrounding sects; their nervous system received a shock; and when they heard their neighbours shrieking, or saw them thrown prostrate to the earth, writhing in agony, and calling on Jesus to rescue them from the bottomless pit, it is no wonder that a few young persons, chiefly delicate females, were unable to resist a contagion which might put the self-controlling power of the strongest man to a severe test. When one such person yielded to the influences which were brought to bear upon her and was "stricken,"—that is, deprived of the power of her limbs, with partial or total loss of consciousness for a time,—great was the rejoicing and loud were the pæans chanted on the wonderful triumph. The triumph was proclaimed at prayer-meetings, celebrated in newspapers, and heralded to the south, the east and the west, in the letters of correspondents, as an augury of the speedy downfal of the "God-denying heresy." For the destruction of Unitarianism, solemn prayers were repeatedly offered up; and many of these, and indeed most of those presented in connection with the revival, were addressed not to the God and Father of all, but to the Lord Jesus. As might be expected from the youth and ignorance of many of the persons employed in leading the worship, some of these prayers were as silly as they were unscriptural. "Come unto me," said a child of ten or twelve years old, who was permitted by a Presbyterian minister to conduct the devotional services of his congregation,—"Come unto me, O Lord Jesus, *and I will give you rest!*" Another youthful convert besought the Lord Jesus to come and rescue his followers "*from the pit of salvation!*" And we, who believe it to be unwarrantable to address prayer to any but the Living and True God, and who believe that the Divine Spirit is not the author of nonsense and absurdity, are required to demonstrate, to the satisfaction of professing Unitarians, enlightened and liberal Christians, that they are mistaken when they think they see in all this the immediate work of the Spirit of God!

As might be expected, the anti-Unitarian zeal of some of the agents in this work led them, in some instances, to misconceive and very grossly to misrepresent facts which they had seen through the coloured medium of sectarian prejudice. The Rev. Mr. Marrable, a clergyman of the Church of England, came to Ballymena while the fever was at its height,—was told one of

the hundred lying tales which were from day to day put into circulation,—swallowed it with implicit and uninquiring faith, —and in due time published it abroad in a printed account of his tour. He said that two young persons belonging to the Unitarian congregation in Ballymena,—whom he indicated, by means of initials and descriptive circumstances, in such a manner that the individuals might just as well have been named,—had been, during the revival, converted from their erroneous faith; he reported expressions, full of contempt, which they were said to have used with respect to it; their words, declaring a fixed determination never again to enter the chapel which they had hitherto attended; and language, full of blasphemy and impiety, which their minister, the Rev. John A. Crozier, was stated to have used to them and in their presence. *There was not a syllable of truth in the whole story!* And although the two young persons referred to, and their father and mother, and the minister thus belied, published the most emphatic contradiction of it in every one of its facts and circumstances, it has never yet been retracted, and is in many quarters still believed, and accepted as an undeniable proof that the hand and spirit of God were at work in "the blessed revival of religion in Ulster!" But this is by no means the worst example of the deliberate falsehoods by which the movement was urged forward and followed up. Upon that topic we shall hereafter have a few remarks to offer. Meanwhile, it is our object to illustrate, for the information of our "non-sectarian" readers, the bitter spirit of hostility to Unitarianism by which the movement was characterized from the very outset. In truth, its supposed tendency to draw away members from the Unitarian to the orthodox churches, was undoubtedly one of its features which very much commended it to the friends of evangelical religion, both in the province of Ulster and at a distance. It was the bait by which many were caught, who, but for this device, would have exerted their sagacity much sooner than they did, in ascertaining the real nature of the Revival movement. Their zeal was enkindled and their sympathy enlisted in favour of a process which, as it was represented to them, held forth the prospect of utterly uprooting from the soil of Ireland the pestilent heresy of Unitarianism; and they inquired no farther. While on this topic, we may advert to a letter which we have seen from a revivalist minister addressed to a Unitarian divine who happened to be present at a revival meeting, the writer of which seemed to expect that his heretical brother would be brought over to the true faith by hearing so many of the converts,—chiefly, it may be remarked, boys and girls under the age of fourteen, one apparently not more than ten,—declare that they had "found peace" and "full assurance" after, and in answer to, prayer addressed to the Lord Jesus!

So far all was peace among the revivalists. Presbyterians,

Episcopalians, Methodists of every shade and colour, were actively engaged in a crusade against the common enemy, and all of them appeared to work harmoniously together. But Catholics and Unitarians are not the only ones to be dreaded and disliked by a portion of the self-styled "religious world." In the midst of the evangelical ranks are jealousies and suspicions, not the less deep because they are not paraded on platforms. While the fever was at its height, an Episcopalian clergyman, of pre-eminent zeal for the Evangelical cause, astonished the members of his own Church, and confounded the great body of the spiritual agitators, by declaring, in a speech delivered at the meeting of the Evangelical Alliance, that he had narrowly watched the movement, and had found it to be so directed as to have become a hostile influence brought to bear upon the Established Church. We give his own words: "I say advisedly that this Revival movement has been so managed as to have become a proselytizing engine directed against the Church of which I am a member." It is no wonder that the reverend gentleman, surrounded as he was by the advocates of the system which he thus denounced, was assailed by a clamour which almost prevented him from continuing his address; but his words were heard and have produced their effect. The clergy of the Church of England have ever since, as a body, stood aloof from the revival, and very few of the laity of that communion now speak of it otherwise than in terms of sorrow or derision. We copy the following from the Rev. W. M'Ilwaine's pamphlet, premising that the writer is a respected episcopal clergyman of high evangelical sentiments and pre-eminent for ministerial zeal: "Sufficient, perhaps, has been said of the evil consequences of this wretched system; there is one other on which my limits permit me to say but a passing word. *It has been abused, to my own knowledge, to the vilest purposes of sectarianism and proselytism, properly so called.* The ranks of those sects around us whose staple is extravagance and excitement, are at this moment recruited by the victims of the current and popular delusion." *(M'Ilwaine,* p. 16.)

So much for the "non-sectarian" character which at one time was loudly claimed for the movement by its advocates. *It never deserved it.* It was from the first bitterly, intensely sectarian, as against Romanism and Unitarianism; and it is now denounced as animated by a proselytizing aim, directed against that very Church whose ministers, coming from a distance to view the remarkable events of which they had heard, and unacquainted with the character and history of the men with whom they had to deal, became easy dupes to an artfully contrived system; and, through the medium of their reports, published in newspapers, pamphlets and magazines, were the chief instruments by which the delusion was spread throughout the length and breadth of the United Kingdom.

We must reserve for another paper what we have to say respecting the physical and moral (or immoral) results of the revival, so far as they have hitherto developed themselves. We shall conclude, for the present, with the following sentences from the pen of one of the most respected clergymen of the Evangelical persuasion in the north of Ireland, one who in a case of this kind is certainly not to be considered as prejudiced against any movement that could fairly or even plausibly claim to be a spiritual awakening. He says,—

"And here let me be permitted *to put persons at a distance on their guard against certain statements which have been sent on their rounds, through the public press*, by means of 'Revival organs' and otherwise, respecting the work in progress. It would be a task as distasteful as perhaps needless to expose *the large amount of fiction and fallacy* which has thus got into circulation. It is *really marvellous how persons in the rank of Christian ministers and others could so commit themselves*. Painful as it is to do so, the public must be reminded that the character, circumstances and credibility of the witness ought, in every such case, to be fully taken into account. And how is it in this case? Without venturing to impugn the sincerity or truthfulness of *many* of those who have volunteered to undertake tours of inspection and to publish them, I must be permitted to remind those who have read these publications of the circumstances under which, as well as the persons by whom, they were written. First came forth *a most marvellous and exaggerated statement of the Revival movement*, by means of the public press and its organs. I say deliberately, a most exaggerated statement. Some specimens of it shall presently be submitted. Then, from distant parishes, and with minds so prepared to receive all the wonders narrated, came ministers of religion and others, to take *a surface view* of what was going on, and then to print and publish it. *The qualifications, retractions and explanations to which some of these gentlemen have been already obliged to resort, are as humiliating as they are instructive.* How could it be otherwise? Prepared to believe and admire all that was seen, *they listened to every story and report, trusted every appearance, endorsed every 'convert,'* and then proceeded to publish their respective tours. *It has been my painful experience to detect the grossest misrepresentation in many of these reports.* I have come into personal contact with many of these alleged converts, and regret to say that my experience of them, *however sincere they may have seemed*, led me to very different conclusions from those of their previous visitors. *More melancholy examples of credulity on the one side, and ignorance, self-deception and superstition on the other*, could hardly be imagined." (*M'Ilwaine*, p. 5.)

These are sensible and judicious remarks, and our readers will do well to bear them in mind. In substance they are fully borne out by the statements of several other writers, whose publications we have enumerated.

A REPLY TO SOME RECENT STRICTURES IN THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER ON AN ARTICLE IN THE NATIONAL REVIEW ON EWALD'S "APOSTOLIC AGE."

SIR,

WHEN a man gives his thoughts to the public, especially if they controvert received opinions, he must expect to have them challenged and criticised; and if the animadversions to which he is subjected, shew competent knowledge of the subject and display a fair and candid spirit, he has no reason to complain. It is only by such discussion that whatever truth his speculations may contain, can be more fully brought out, and the error involved in them be exposed and dissipated. Under ordinary circumstances, I should have been well content to let whatever I may have written, quietly produce its own effect of approval or rejection in the minds of readers, without engaging any further in its assertion or defence. I have little time and less taste for controversy. But the allusions in an article in your last number, signed "An Unitarian Layman," are so distinctly personal, and the imputations of various kinds contained in it are so fitted to leave a mistaken and even an injurious impression behind them, that, however disagreeable the task, I do not feel myself at liberty to allow them to pass without reply.

Allow me, in the first place, a word or two about Ewald himself. Your correspondent seems to think it "a matter of little moment what Ewald may have thought or written on the subject of the resurrection of Christ;" and words of my own are cited from the article in the *National Review* to detract from his authority, and make it appear a loss of time for any English reader to give himself the trouble to learn the opinions of such a man. In criticising his work, it was a simple act of literary honesty to notice the defects of temper and judgment with which this eminent scholar is undoubtedly chargeable. But the words which I have used in speaking of his extraordinary merits, ought in fairness to have been quoted along with those in which I have felt it necessary to employ the language of censure. Ewald is one of the most religious of the great philologists of Germany, full of reverence for the Scriptures and for the character and work of Christ. It is rather his distinction among his class. I have not scrupled to say of him: "Everywhere we recognize the fervour and earnestness of his spirit and its elevated moral tone, the vast extent and minute exactness of his philological attainments, the depth and richness of his critical resources, the readiness and fertility of his combinations, and his comprehensive grasp at once in its broadest features and smallest details of the national life of Judaism." (*Nat. Rev.* for July, p. 119.) Whatever your correspondent may think, I venture to assert that it is not unimportant for any one who would keep pace with the pro-

gress of theological ideas, to learn what so profound a Hebraist has thought on any point of Hebrew belief; and I feel confident that I shall be borne out in this assertion by all who have sufficient knowledge of the subject to qualify them to offer an opinion. Ewald, like some great scholars of our own country, Wakefield, Warburton and Bentley, is too conscious of his vast intellectual wealth and strength; and this renders him at times haughty and contemptuous in his bearing towards other men, and fills him with an overweening conceit of the value and justness of his own theories. But there are few from whom so much is to be learned. His very errors and extravagances, rich as they are in learning and in thought, are more pregnant with instruction for those who understand how to use them, than thousands of worn-out truisms that go unquestioned through the world.

Let me take this opportunity of expressing my obligations to your correspondent for pointing out to me the very faulty construction of a sentence of mine (written, it is true, when my mind was somewhat exhausted by a long term of academic labour, but not therefore excusable), in which two quarrelsome *its*, not able to settle their rival claims, leave us in doubt, like some other disputants, which is right and which is wrong. I must put an end to this unhappy litigation by deciding, once for all, that "its" with "final result" belongs to the "history of the Hebrew people," but that the second "it" is nevertheless entitled to take up the "final result" as its own. I fully acquiesce in the propriety of your correspondent's seasonable interposition.

Before proceeding to the main subject of this discussion, I wish to dispose of one or two personal matters. I am charged by your correspondent with vagueness of statement and with not writing intelligibly. No man is more aware than myself of the great imperfection of my style. But with regard to its "confused obscurity," some who are pretty good judges of English composition have remarked to me, that whatever objections in other respects the offending article may lie open to, its language is perfectly clear; and an earlier critic (C. R., October, p. 578) has observed, that "its positions, even when vague, are throughout intelligible." As to vagueness, may not your correspondent's charge be retorted on himself? After reading over repeatedly what he has written in p. 708, I confess I do not understand him. I cannot find in the passages there quoted or referred to, the shadow of a ground for the accusation—that I am even unconsciously unjust and unfair, that I assume unbecoming airs of originality where there is nothing new, that I "undervalue the wisdom of our ancestors" and fall into the "more serious error of understating it." Your correspondent must be under some hallucination. He is fighting with a phantom of his own creation, and sees in my pages what is only the reflection of some strange idea that has got possession of his mind. I have carefully looked

over these pages again, and I say deliberately, without fear of contradiction from any unprejudiced reader, from any one who is not determined to find what he has already pre-conceived, that I have not written a single word to justify any one of the three charges here alleged. I have called it "a great mistake to treat Christianity so entirely as an isolated event—a fact *sui generis*—in the course of human affairs." I call it so still; and I appeal to the great mass of works on the Evidences and the History of the Scriptures current and popular in this country, in proof of the fact that Christianity is still generally regarded in that light. When the present learned and accomplished Dean of St. Paul's published many years ago a "History of the Jews" based to a large extent on the opposite view, he found to his cost what hostility his work excited. It perhaps lost him a bishopric. He has written his "History of Christianity" in the same enlightened spirit, but I see no evidence that the general feeling of the Christian public has yet undergone any material change. I think, therefore, I was fully justified in making that statement; but I have nowhere claimed for it any novelty or originality. Ewald, indeed, has handled the history of Christianity in a manner so strikingly his own, that it might perhaps be said of him that he has the merit of placing many old facts in a comparatively new point of view. But I cannot find that I have anywhere asserted this. On the contrary, I have most distinctly classed him with some others. I have said that he takes "a broader view *than is often the case.*" Your correspondent observes, with a solemnity almost ludicrous, "that good and able men," "long before the day of Ewald and his reviewer," have dwelt on the connection between the Jewish and Christian dispensations, and on the relations of both to the general condition of mankind. Does he really suppose me ignorant of so notorious a fact? Does he imagine that, because my subject did not require me to mention particularly the labours of such men, I therefore undervalued them, as furnishing in their time and place important contributions to the formation of theological opinion? I say contributions, because I do not allow, that on a subject which is essentially progressive, even the best works can do more than contribute to knowledge. Your correspondent surely does not mean to insinuate, that in prosecuting our inquiries we are to be precluded from embracing any new views which commend themselves to our reason and are supported by irresistible evidence; and that in deliberately adopting them, we thereby cast a slight on what we have already learned from earlier instructors. Yet I am hardly able to put any other interpretation on a sentence which is almost as involved and obscure as one of mine already referred to, which he so properly condemned. He reminds me that "I might have known, and must have forgotten, how in schools of instruction which were open to me, the connection between the

Jewish and Christian dispensations was dwelt upon and illustrated, and the general condition of the world at the time when Christ appeared was stated, amongst other grounds of evidence, as strikingly and beautifully illustrating the manner in which Divine Wisdom had adapted means to ends." Certainly it is a plain case enough that "I might have known" what I was once taught; and it is also possible that, like many another unprofitable student, I may have forgotten what I was taught. But if the reference in this sphinx-like oracle be, as I conjecture it must be, to the lecture-room of a most accomplished instructor and venerated friend now no more, I take leave to say, that I respect and cherish what I formerly learned from that honoured and excellent man quite as profoundly perhaps and gratefully as your correspondent; and if there be one lesson more than another which those wise and enlightened teachings have permanently impressed on my mind, it is this,—to value their *spirit* more than their *form*, to work on in the power and freedom of the general principle which animated them, rather than to hold myself bound by any particular conclusion into which for the time they might have shaped themselves. I believe that our revered Tutor would consider his memory more honoured by pupils who, in his own candid and truthful spirit, modify or abandon any doctrines once taught by him when increase of light has shewn them to be erroneous, than by such as, in the spirit of unyielding dogmatism, cling with a blind and ignorant tenacity to his whole system of ideas, corresponding, as it necessarily must, to the state of knowledge half a century ago. To accept new light as it comes to us, is not to assume any superiority over our predecessors, but simply to do what they would themselves have done were they living now. This may be done in perfect humility, with the deepest sense of feeble powers and limited attainment, with the consciousness in fact of no other feeling than that of simple allegiance to truth. Thus much I have felt myself obliged to say in reply to charges so confidently made and so singularly ill supported. Your correspondent's oracular tone of rebuke addressed to men who have at least paid as much attention to the subjects on which they write as himself, and the quiet assumption of being undoubtedly in the right which pervades his letter, may raise the question in some minds whether he possesses enough of the judicial faculty which he so highly values, to qualify him to pronounce sentence in this summary way, and whether he is not himself obnoxious to the very censure which he so freely administers to others.

One of the charges brought against the article in question is, that it does not keep the views of Ewald and those of the reviewer sufficiently distinct. In the analysis and criticism of a complex work, it is scarcely possible that some such intermingling should not take place, especially in passages where there is any coincidence of ideas between the reviewer and the subject

of his criticism. Throughout, however, I think it will be found that what is Ewald's and what is my own are pretty clearly marked off from each other. This is particularly the case in regard to his views about the resurrection. I distinctly give a summary of them, commencing at the top of p. 142 and terminating about the middle of p. 143, with references all through the summary to the pages in Ewald's volume. No reader of common attention can have overlooked the fact, that I am here giving Ewald's opinion alone, without expressing either approval or disapproval. At the end of the summary I add, that "his statements are open to many objections in detail, and that his view of the whole subject is not always consistent with itself." In his account of the appearances of Christ after his death, I further remark, that "he has given utterance to feelings which must often have passed through the minds of thoughtful readers in reference to this part of the evangelical narrative." My allusion, it is obvious, is to the mysterious and fitful character of those appearances, so different from the ordinary manifestation of a human body under the known conditions of terrestrial existence. To this extent I agree with Ewald. In *accounting* for the impressions so strongly made on the minds of the disciples which led them to believe in the restoration of their Master to life, I differ from him. So far as I can make out his views, which he has shrouded in more than his ordinary obscurity, he considers the whole affair to have been what the Germans would call a *subjective process*, an intensifying into peculiar vividness of ideas and remembrances already in the mind, without being occasioned by any *extra-personal* influence. For myself, I do not think this an adequate explanation of the phenomena. I cannot account for the recorded change in the language and conduct of the disciples, without the supposition of some presence visiting them, which they recognized in some way inexplicable by us, as that of a real person from the invisible world, —an impression, therefore, which had a cause outside themselves, and was not a mere product of the working of excited minds. I call this a *spiritual* fact, from the want of any more appropriate term to express a reality made cognizable and certain to a human soul through some other avenue than the outward senses. The difference between my own view and Ewald's is, I should think, obvious enough. There seems to me satisfactory evidence that Christ's resurrection or ascension (ἀνάστασις or ἀνάληψις), whichever term we prefer to adopt (for I regard them as only different forms of expression for one and the same mysterious and unsearchable fact, his passage from the present into the next life), was so witnessed to the minds of believers (not through the violation of any natural law, but in virtue of some deeper law affecting the relations of the seen and the unseen worlds, than we are yet able to trace), that they were convinced of the perpetuity of

his existence and of the reality of his occasional intercourse with them. My belief, therefore, in the *reality* of a resurrection historically attested is just as strong as theirs who take all the accounts of the bodily re-appearance in the strictest and most literal sense. Whereas I cannot find that Ewald, though doubtless having a firm general faith in immortality, believes in any direct and extraordinary witness to a resurrection at all.

The views which I have ventured to express on this subject, are not views taken up on a sudden and without much reflection; still less have they been adopted from any blind admiration of great German authorities. They were substantially mine long before I had studied Ewald or even heard of his name. At an early age the question of immortal life haunted my mind as, next to a trust in the living God, the grandest and most solemn interest of our mortal being. I inherited the persuasion, which was all but universal in my youth among our denomination of Christians, that the resurrection of Christ as usually understood was the corner-stone of that belief. I remember well how anxiously I studied the records of it, in the hope of finding perfect satisfaction. If I had prejudices, they were strongly in favour of belief, not of disbelief. The narrative left on my mind conflicting impressions which I could not reconcile. The profound conviction of the apostolic age, inspiring its marvellous sacrifices and heroic martyrdoms, and attested, outside scripture, by manifold witnesses, heathen and post-apostolic, assured me that those early believers must have had some extraordinary evidence of *a* resurrection. Mere *subjective* persuasion, possessing simultaneously so many minds, seemed to me an inadequate explanation of the phenomena. There must have been, I felt, some influence out of the usual order of nature at the bottom of the whole affair. At the same time there was something so strange, inexplicable and even inconsistent in the recorded appearances before the ascension and in the ascension itself, that I found an insurmountable difficulty in taking them for simple historical events, and supposed it possible they might have grown imperceptibly into this form under the moulding influence of oral tradition, out of the mysterious report of *spiritual* experiences, of the kind already described. But the difficulty was a fact, whether I could explain it or not. I let my faith, therefore, rest practically on the evidence, to me satisfactory, that *a* resurrection had taken place and been witnessed in some way or other to the minds of believers; and I left the accounts of the *bodily* appearances in the obscurity in which I found them,—as a kind of proof which carried no conviction to my own mind, which seemed to me wholly unsuited to the subject to which it was applied, and on which I could not but feel that a disproportionate and even a mischievous stress had been laid in arguing the momentous question of immortal life. Proof was wanted, not of a renewed *terrestrial*, but of entrance

into a *celestial*, life. So it was that my opinions assumed their present form; and I only mention the circumstance to shew that, whether right or wrong, they have not been extemporized, but slowly worked out through many intervening phases of doubt and difficulty, after an anxious comparison of conflicting phenomena, and with an earnest endeavour to get at the truth by placing those phenomena in their proper relation to each other. The result has been increased tranquillity to my own mind, in the conviction that man is essentially a spiritual and immortal being,—that he has even here on earth relations real and solemn, though not always traceable by us, with an invisible state beyond the phenomenal world,—and that at a few rare and favoured moments the veil has been pierced and a presence come through it to believing souls, to convince them, on evidence which material sense could not grasp, that death is only a passage into life.

Having replied to personal charges, pointed out the difference between my own views and Ewald's, and attempted to explain in what sense I accept the evidence for the reality of a resurrection, I have accomplished the principal object of this communication, and might here terminate the discussion. I wish, however, to add a few words on one or two other points. Your intelligent correspondent for October, who signs himself "A Unitarian Minister," and whose general ability and scholarly treatment of this subject I willingly acknowledge, though his peculiar cast of mind seems to disqualify him for doing full justice to views opposed to his own,—has put my judgment on the resurrection in the same class with the dreams of Woolston. But there is really no analogy between them, and the comparison is not a fair one. Woolston allegorized the whole of the historical narrative of the New Testament into an emblematical representation of the spiritual life of Christ in the soul. I have done nothing of the sort. I have never questioned in a passing hint the historical reality of Christ's actions and teachings. I have simply argued, from what appears to me the least difficult interpretation of the facts of the case, that Christ's manifestation to his disciples after death must have been something different from a mere *bodily* restoration from the grave. I understand the same writer to deny that the bodily resurrection of Christ ever could be, or ever had been, appealed to by intelligent persons as any ground of belief in human immortality. "Those," he says, "who have suggested that it was a transition state intermediate between the gross bodily life and the purely spiritual, seem to me not to understand what they affirm, any more than those who point to it as the pattern of our immortal life" (p. 588). This somewhat sharp and sweeping censure includes Neander, if his words have any meaning, to say nothing of other eminent and learned men, and certainly Dr. Priestley. I find others, pretty well acquainted with the history of opinion in our body, agree with myself that

in the earlier part of this century it was certainly the prevalent belief, diffused by the writings of Mr. Belsham, Dr. Priestley and Bishop Law, that the bodily resurrection of Christ was the only reliable evidence of a future life. Indeed in any other view it is difficult to see why such immense stress should have been laid on it. If it was only one among many miracles attesting divine authority, the circumstances accompanying it were less wonderful than those of the raising of Lazarus. I have the most distinct recollection of its being the direct aim of views then current, and maintained by many eminent men, to discredit as of no weight all the natural presumptions in favour of immortality derived from the spiritual nature of man and his filial relationship to the everlasting Fountain of life. The turn given to opinion on this subject in another and, as I believe, a better direction, was due mainly to the effect of Dr. Channing's writings; and I have a tolerably distinct impression that they were objected to at first by some of the older school as mystical. Mr. Furness, quoted by your correspondent (p. 585), says that still "the general belief is that Christ rose from the dead to establish the doctrine of the life beyond the grave." I have before me a well-known Sermon of Dr. Priestley's, preached in the Assembly-room at Buxton in 1790, in which he sets out with affirming the natural improbability of a future life, and then asserts (p. 6) that "Jesus Christ actually died and rose again as a *proof* of the reality" "of a proper resurrection of the dead;" and further on (p. 53), that we are to consider "his resurrection as a *pledge* and *assurance* of our own, which it is the great object of Christianity to enforce." Now it is to this view of the bodily resurrection of Christ that I object, as having no bearing, that I am able to discern, on the conclusion which it is supposed to establish. What the "Unitarian Minister's" own views are, I find it difficult to make out. They seem to me in an unfixed and transitional state. They are not those which once prevailed extensively in our denomination, and made a bodily resurrection the only sure and solid ground of belief in a future life. He shrouds them in "mystery," which he considers it "mere folly and presumption to attempt to penetrate" (p. 588). Yet about a real body, attested by eating, drinking, handling, &c., how should there be any mysterious uncertainty? It is a simple fact of daily experience which every one readily comprehends. The plain, straightforward understanding of Dr. Priestley would have found no difficulty in admitting it.

The same writer (p. 585) denies that any direct evidence has ever been given, and questions how it can be given, of uninterrupted personal existence in the invisible state which lies beyond this world. Where, then, I ask is the value of the fact of the resurrection in relation to a future life? If it teach us nothing *directly*, if we are left to get at the truth circuitously, by inference, analogy, elaborate combination and anxious deduction,—

if we can appeal to no fact directly witnessing a communication from the invisible to the visible world,—we are still in the condition of those who have only their ordinary reason to instruct them; and I cannot on this ground understand why your correspondent, and those who think with him, should attach such extreme importance to the special fact of a bodily resurrection, that any questioning of its literal acceptance is considered little less than an upsetting of Christianity itself. Your correspondent treats the supposition of any spiritual evidence of the resurrection as an absurdity. Does he, then, consider Paul's solemn asseveration of having seen the ascended Christ to be a delusion or a falsehood? I have never asserted anything half so offensive to the common belief of Christians as this. Are we to suppose that the Father of our spirits can only communicate with us through our bodies? that his access to us through our souls is impassably closed up? that He can give us no intimation of that spiritual life which is laid up for us with Christ in Him, but by the revival of functions which are appropriate to this terrestrial existence alone, and do not of themselves point beyond it? Such reasoning, if I rightly apprehend its tendency, excludes all revelation of spiritual realities to the soul as an impossibility. Here we are in the body, and we can only know what the body is capable of transmitting to us. This idea has taken such a hold of some minds that they confound all spiritual manifestation with imposition. Speaking of the theory that the evidence of the resurrection was not bodily but spiritual, the Unitarian Layman quotes with evident approval the observation of a friend: "In other words, he said, the advocates of this theory impute to the Almighty the attempt to impose upon mankind by false appearances;" and he then adds this remark of his own: "I suppose that Ewald and his reviewer consider that it was reserved for their superior penetration, after the lapse of eighteen centuries, to detect the imposition." If I thought the writer really understood the meaning of his own words, I should say, their absurdity was only equalled by their irreverence. These gentlemen undertake to affirm, that any direct communication of spiritual truth to our human consciousness, any unveiling under the illumination of the Divine Spirit of the solemn realities of an invisible world to the inward eye of the soul (and how do they dare to measure all history by their personal experience, and declare such things an impossibility?), is nothing better than a deception practised by the Almighty on his creatures; and that men who, in the earnest search after the religious peace of their own souls, have humbly and seriously found reason to believe the fact, can be regarded in no other light than as detectors by their superior penetration of the divine imposture. It has rarely been my lot to encounter language more uncharitable and, in form at least, more profane than this. Had it occurred, where I do

not believe it would have been admitted, in any of the publications of Mr. Holyoake, all parties would have perceived its indecency, and visited it with the reprobation which it merits. For myself, believing as I do in the existence of a spiritual life beyond the limits of the present phenomenal life, and seeing no reason to doubt that under extraordinary circumstances there may be a transmission of intelligence from the higher to the lower world, I declare, without hesitation (and I believe the declaration consistent with the principles of the truest philosophy), that *on equal evidence* I would recognize with Paul, as an objective reality, the presence of a deceased person from the other world.

I have been charged by your last correspondent with not fully stating the facts on both sides of this question; and I am solemnly exhorted, as a great delinquent in this respect, to "study and imitate" "the calm impartiality of those who have preceded me in the office which I hold," and whose theological conclusions, it is pretty broadly insinuated, I despise (pp. 707 and 717.) The last imputation I have already disposed of, and need not revert to it again. With regard to holding the balance unfairly between conflicting arguments in my teaching, as this is a direct charge on my academic integrity and faithfulness, I shall not descend to reply to it in any other way than by a simple appeal to those who have the means of judging, which the writer has not. In the article in the *National*, I was not writing a dissertation on the resurrection, where the accusation, if just, would have been to the purpose, but had merely to allude in passing to one particular aspect of it. But in point of fact, I have not left out of view any of the recorded appearances of Christ after his resurrection; I have actually assumed them all, as the very subject of discussion—the question simply being how those appearances are to be interpreted, and how the belief in them originated. The writer does not understand the question at issue. I have remarked, that with a few exceptional traits, which we can probably trace to the hardening influence of a later tradition, those appearances possess a character which it is difficult to reconcile with the presence of a human body such as we alone know and understand it. Let us take for an example one of the most fully recorded of these appearances, that which occurred to the two disciples as they walked to Emmaus (Luke xxiv.). In the course of a prolonged conversation, which turned on Christ and which must have brought up his image vividly before them, though (upon the supposition) his bodily presence was at their side the whole time, and the marks on his hands and feet must have been conspicuous, and though he reasoned with them on the subject of his previous teachings and even upbraided them for their slowness to believe, yet we are told "their eyes were holden that they should not know him." At length in the evening at supper time, when he was breaking bread with them, their eyes were suddenly opened,

and they knew him—when he vanished out of their sight. Now whatever explanation may be given of this narrative, no person reading it for the first time with a mind wholly unprepossessed could, I think, resist the impression that we have here an account of something very different from intercourse through the outward senses. The concluding expression, ἄφαντος ἐγένετο ἀπ' αὐτῶν, would never have been used of the ordinary departure of a human body. A similar character attaches to other descriptions of Christ's re-appearances. The fact that these re-appearances were vouchsafed only to believers, is made light of by your October correspondent: and the Unitarian Layman following him, accuses me of "quietly assuming as a fact what is neither proved nor admitted." I should have thought he must have retained enough of logic from his academic training to know that I cannot be called on to prove a negative. I assumed nothing. I said then, as I say now, that *all* recorded appearances are to believers only. If he or the "Unitarian Minister" can adduce a single instance to the contrary, I will confess myself mistaken. But all the extant evidence that we have is wholly on my side. Had there been a bodily resurrection, I hold it impossible that, familiar as Christ's person must have been to thousands, both friends and enemies, in Jerusalem and in Galilee, and with those unmistakeable marks on the hands and feet, he should not have been frequently recognized, and that if he were recognized by those who were not among his followers, we should have heard nothing of it. Your correspondent for October says, "It is inconceivable to me that during forty days in Galilee, Jesus should have been seen by absolutely none but believers." I agree with him entirely, on the supposition that a body had re-appeared; but I am surprised that a writer of his acuteness should not have seen that in replying in this way to my statement, he was taking for granted the very point in dispute between us, viz., that it was a body. It is easy to assume an authoritative tone and say, "These texts have been explained against Woolston and others often enough." Are we to take the writer's warrant for the sufficiency of these explanations? Let them be produced, and we shall see. No one knows better than the writer, that assertions were made, and reasonings deemed conclusive, in the old deistical controversy which would not stand the test of modern criticism. But we are not left to inference alone from extant data in this matter. One of the most industrious and exact of the New Testament writers, who traced up all his statements to their primitive source, has recorded it as the distinct declaration of an apostle, that Christ's manifestation after his death was limited to a select number of witnesses. I am not conscious of urging this text particularly hard, when I say, that no language can be more express and distinct than what is put into the mouth of Peter (Acts x. 41). It is defined at once negatively and posi-

tively. Christ was made manifest (ἐμφανῆ γενέσθαι) "not to all the people" (by which I understand, it was not a promiscuous, general manifestation), "but" (and here to exclude all uncertainty, the parties to whom he was to shew himself are mentioned as specially appointed for the purpose) "to witnesses previously chosen (προκεχειροτονημένοις) by God."

The "Unitarian Minister" objects to our taking the statements of Paul as the proper point of departure in this question, and considers it as a "needless, if not wilful, inversion of the natural order of events" (p. 582). These are strong assertions, and ought to be strongly supported. He adds, "I believe the common opinion of our four existing Gospels having been written before the destruction of Jerusalem to be quite beyond reasonable cavil" (p. 583). As this is merely the opinion of an individual writer, unsupported by proof, we may set against it the opinion of men of at least equal learning, who have come to a different conclusion. Where no proofs are adduced, one assertion is as good as another. I do not hesitate to avow my own belief, founded on some inquiry into the subject, that there are wider intervals between the dates of the several Gospels than the foregoing statement admits, and that none of them, in *their actual form*, can be *proved* to have been written anterior to the destruction of Jerusalem. We find no distinct allusion to any of them by name before the second half of the second century; and though they must have existed, and we find clear evidence of their materials, before that time, it seems to me impossible to assign with precision their actual date. Their substantial materials, their record of Christ's sayings and doings, and the spirit animating them, so different from anything in Heathenism and the old Judaism, are, I doubt not, an authentic representation of the belief of the apostolic age; but before those materials were put together in the form in which we now possess them, I cannot feel equally sure, that some later elements of belief may not have been introduced into them; I even think here and there we can discern traces of the fact. But there is another consideration of some weight which the "Unitarian Minister" will be able to appreciate, though it may not be so easy to make it intelligible to those who have not much exercised their minds in inquiries of this description. There is a marked difference of thought and feeling between the several Gospels, implying progressive development in their conception of the facts of Christ's ministry and of the fundamental ideas of his teaching, which cannot be supposed to have taken place except during a very considerable lapse of time. In Matthew we have probably the original Palestinian tradition respecting Jesus. Mark's position in the series I leave undecided. But between the general tone of thought pervading Matthew and belonging to its original Judaic materials, and that which characterizes Luke, written for

a heathen convert, there is a wide and perceptible difference which implies the occurrence of a considerable interval of time. The difference between John and any one of the three earlier Gospels is so marked, that it is hardly possible it could have been written till towards the end of the first century. But with regard to all the greater Epistles of Paul (and I mention these not as excluding the lesser, but merely to confine myself to what is on all hands undisputed), we are not only certain of their genuineness and authenticity, but we can fix within a year or two the date of every one of them. I return, then, unshaken to my original position, that in the writings of Paul we have the oldest, the most direct and the most reliable testimony to the resurrection of Christ—the first clear evidence of that profound conviction of a risen Christ (implying some fact as its cause) which had transformed the mind of the apostle himself, and was introducing a new spiritual vitality into the world. We are justified, I contend, in taking our point of departure in this question from the statements of Paul, and in constructing from the point of view thus given to us, the statements of other writings which, though recording the earthly ministry of Christ, wove together, at a later date and possibly under later influences, into the form in which we now have them, the materials of which they consist. Now what Paul says in 1 Cor. xv. seems to me a cardinal statement in this matter. He speaks distinctly of successive manifestations of Christ—to Simon Peter, to the Twelve, then to five hundred brethren at one time (the majority of them surviving to the time when Paul wrote), again to James, then to all the apostles, lastly to Paul himself. Paul makes no distinction between any of these manifestations. He puts his own seeing of Christ on the same level with that of the other apostles. The very same verb is used in every instance—ὤφθη. How is this to be explained? It ought not to be passed over without notice. Was Paul speaking the truth in this or a falsehood, or labouring under a delusion? He must have known from tradition (ὃ καὶ παρέλαβον) whether the apostles who preceded him had conversed with a body or not. Yet here we find one word, implying one mode of manifestation, applied to appearances, some of which, according to the usual conception of this subject, must have occurred before, and some after the ascension—some in the body, some out of the body. His rising again is considered in this chapter of Corinthians as an anticipation of the general resurrection of the dead—an example, as it were, beforehand of the general destiny of the race. Hence it is argued, that "if there be no resurrection of the dead, then Christ has not risen;" inasmuch as the law under which alone he could rise, would not in that case form a part of the divine economy. In the same sense, he is called the "first fruits of them that have been laid to rest." His rising again was valuable to believers, as an earnest and exemplification

of the higher spiritual life which awaited them. The restoration of his earthly body had no bearing whatever on the only point that was of importance. That would have been a σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως which had no relation to the πολίτευμα ἐν οὐρανοῖς (Philipp. iii. 20, 21). What they needed to behold was the σῶμα τῆς δόξης which their risen Lord wore in heaven, in which he occasionally manifested himself to the eye of faith on earth, and into the likeness of which he would change their earthly bodies at the time of the restitution of all things. The only sense in which the resurrection of Christ can be religiously of value to a dweller on earth, is as the witness of a life beyond the terrestrial life. In that light it is exhibited by Paul.

Your correspondent, the "Unitarian Minister," all but throws overboard, if I rightly understand him, the New Testament statement about the ascension. Yet the ascension is the necessary sequel of a bodily resurrection. I do not see how it can be got rid of. If the mortal body of Jesus was restored full and perfect from the grave, he must either have died once more a natural death, or some such metamorphosis and transition as the ascension must have occurred. An event like the ascension was necessary, on the supposition of a bodily resurrection, to transfer the renewed life on earth to that higher life in heaven which is implied in the effusion of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, and in the subsequent visions of Stephen and Paul. I do not understand what ground there is for making such a distinction between the resurrection and the ascension—for arguing that everything is clear and self-consistent about the former, everything about the latter impenetrably obscure. Both seem to me to have the same vague, dim and visionary character, and both to be inseparably connected as necessary counterparts of one and the same conception. Starting from the fundamental idea furnished by Paul, I suppose the conception may have arisen in the following way. The manifestations of the risen Jesus were of the kind described in 1 Cor. xv., real and of a living presence, but not conveyed through the outward sense. In the reports handed down by tradition and misapprehended by the grosser mind of the multitude, these spiritual manifestations gradually assumed the form of bodily appearances, especially as the fervour of the primitive faith abated. When Docetic errors began to prevail, which changed the earthly life of Christ into a phantom, the mass of Christians opposed to these fancies had a strong motive, operating perhaps unconsciously, to understand the traditional accounts of Christ's spiritual intercourse with his disciples after his death, in a more outward and corporeal sense, lest they should be used to justify applying to the terrestrial ministry of Christ what was true only of his heavenly life,—doctrinal reaction aiding the development of the idea of a bodily resurrection. When the belief in a bodily resurrection had arisen, that

in an ascension followed as its necessary complement. Both were only different modes, determined by the conceptions of a later generation and from a different point of view, of expressing the same primitive fact, — the passage of Jesus from the earthly to the heavenly life.—I am afraid this attempt to explain the possible origin of the belief in a bodily resurrection may give pain to some excellent persons whom I would gladly not offend. But I do not see why I should conceal my serious persuasion on a serious subject. I am not throwing out a hasty idea. If this subject be looked at fairly and dispassionately on all its sides, it will perhaps be found that the views which I have ventured to suggest, though not without their difficulties, involve on the whole the fewest,—that they are most in harmony with the spiritual character of the Christian religion,—and furnish, to those who sincerely embrace them, the most direct and certain evidence of a future life.

I have occupied, Mr. Editor, a large space in your pages. But the circumstances which obliged me to write, obliged me also to write at some length. If I have seemed occasionally to use strong language in replying to the charges of the "Unitarian Layman," it was called for, and is not, I think, stronger than that previously used towards me. He cannot complain of receiving some of his own coin back again. If he thought my views erroneous or mischievous, he should have met them, like your correspondent for October, with argument, not with oracular assertions; and he should have abstained from mixing up with a critical question, general digressions on personal character which had no proper relation to it. I now quit this controversy, and with it throw off into utter forgetfulness every painful feeling which for the moment it may have excited. I sincerely thank your correspondent, the "Unitarian Layman," for many kind expressions of personal regard and appreciation; and, if I am not wholly mistaken in the person of my anonymous opponent, I beg to assure him that I very cordially return them. I give him full credit for having been actuated by what he deemed a sense of duty. Indeed I see evident traces of a conscientious and upright, though, I think, somewhat prejudiced mind. This mistaken feeling of duty has led him to use language which he may hereafter regret, and to dogmatize on some subjects on which he is imperfectly informed. But the whole thing has now passed, and I shall never revert to it again.

With regard to the particular views which I have attempted to justify in this paper, they whose mental temperament has any affinity with my own, will probably to some extent sympathize with me and adopt them; they whose mind is cast in another mould, will continue to think me in grievous error. It is ever so in the controversies most deeply interesting to the human mind; nor can it be otherwise. To me it is delightfully conso-

latory to reflect, of how little importance, in minds essentially religious, these speculative differences, necessitated by the wants of different intellects, really are. Happily, none of us engaged in this controversy have any doubt of that higher life, so wonderfully attested by the first age of Christian believers, for which this present state of conflict and trial is but a discipline and a preparation. Through a different conception and interpretation of the same facts we arrive at a common result. Riper years and longer experience bring with them at once a deeper faith and a wider charity. Through the shadows of advancing life, the mental eye is turned with an intenser gaze and a firmer trust to that approaching futurity where all our present difficulties will find some unexpected solution, where we shall be made to see more clearly than before the folly of bigotry and the presumption of dogmatism, and find after all that the best fruits of speculation and learning are humility and love.

THE AUTHOR OF THE ARTICLE IN THE NATIONAL.

CORRESPONDENCE.

DR. G. B. WINER AND HIS EXPURGATOR.

SIR,

IN the *Christian Examiner* (Boston, U.S.) of November, 1859, there is an able review of a recent translation by Edward Masson, M.A., of Dr. G. B. Winer's Grammar of the New Testament Diction, 6th edition; from which I commend the following extracts to the notice of your readers, partly for the very valuable criticism which they contain, and partly for the very unwarrantable editorial conduct which they so clearly expose and so justly censure.

"In p. 142 of Mr. Masson's translation occurs the following paragraph: 'In regard to Titus ii. 13, ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, the word σωτῆρος does not appear to me a second predicate of θεοῦ, as if Christ were first styled μέγας θεός, and then σώτηρ. My reasons for taking this view of the passage are grounded on Paul's teaching. The article is omitted before σωτῆρος, as the apposition precedes the proper name: *of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.*' Now what Winer actually says is this: 'I hold, on grounds which lie in the doctrinal teaching of Paul, that σωτῆρος is not a second predicate *together with* θεοῦ, as if Christ were first called ὁ μέγας θεός, and then σωτῆρ. The article is omitted before σωτῆρος, *because this word is made definite by the genitive* ἡμῶν, and because the apposition comes *before* the proper name,' &c. Now by translating the German preposition *neben* 'of,' instead of 'together with,' thus making Winer speak of a second predicate of θεοῦ, Mr. Masson has, in the connection, made simple nonsense of the sentence. For the only question in the case is that which relates to the predicate or predicates of Ἰησοῦν Χριστοῦν; in other words, the only question in the case is, whether θεοῦν is or is not a predicate of Ἰησοῦν Χριστοῦν. Again, Mr. Masson, by expunging—whether

by design or accident—the clause, 'because this word [σωτῆρος] is made definite by the genitive ἡμῶν,' has taken away by far the most essential part of the sentence; that is, by far the most important reason for the omission of the article before σωτῆρος. If this expurgation stood alone on this page, we should certainly attribute it to accident. But only a few lines below occurs in the German original this sentence: 'So in Jude, verse fourth, two different subjects [namely, δεσπότην and κύριον] may be referred to, since κύριος, being made definite by ἡμῶν, does not need the article to express the meaning, "Jesus Christ, who is our Lord."' This whole paragraph relating to the verse in Jude is omitted by Winer's translator, if we may not rather say expurgator.

"Again, on the same page, Mr. Masson has omitted a note of Winer, nineteen lines in length. It relates to Titus ii. 13, and states in substance that, though σωτῆρος ἡμῶν *might* be considered a second predicate with θεοῦ in relation to Jesus Christ if the sense demanded it, yet no grammatical principle *requires* it to be so regarded. On the contrary, he maintains in this note that no usage of the Greek article lies in the way of our understanding 'our Lord Jesus Christ' as another subject or person, distinct from 'the great God.' In this note he also expresses his conviction that the apostle Paul could not, in consistency with his teaching in all his Epistles, have called our Saviour Jesus Christ, the great God. This whole note Mr. Masson has expunged, no notice being given of it.

"This is a specimen (observes the reviewer presently afterwards) of the obstacles with which Unitarians have constantly to contend in the propagation of their faith. The very grammars of the Greek language must be expurgated when they seem to favour the doctrinal views of Unitarians."—"May we not hope that it will soon be acknowledged that Unitarians have grammar and philology on their side, as well as reason and common sense?"

This hope appears to me, Mr. Editor, as well grounded as it is encouraging.

Edgbaston, Dec. 22, 1859. SAMUEL BACHE.

MR. FREEMAN ON SOME OF THE TENDENCIES OF UNITARIAN THEOLOGY.

SIR,

SUCH a subject as Religion, especially the religion of the gospel, should be touched with affectionate and reverential anxiety, yet with the energy, decisiveness and simplicity of which itself is the best occasion and warrant. Unsatisfactory mutual implication in real or supposed error is far too often the result of that awe felt towards divinity, which stultifies itself by default of a healthful sympathy with humanity, and its aching hunger and thirst after truth. Not so did Jesus of Nazareth leave his doctrine as a stone in lieu of bread, or as water sparkling to the eye and stimulating to the outward senses, but questionable for assimilation to sound inner life. As a plain thinker, seeking plain means of nutrition for my mind and heart, I am with others in a difficulty of discernment on a point of long-kept faith.

I confess I am now, with many other watchful friends of religious freedom, becoming half-bewildered, half-beguiled, by the pyrotechnics of theology which at present amuse and amaze, by turns and by fits and starts, the Unitarian denomination. I fear, Sir, that intellectual amusement has a much larger share than moral amazement in this matter,—larger too than the leading minds on either side perhaps consider or conjecture. Else they would the sooner desist from all which speculative minds, within and without the denomination, regard as "a rich treat in heretical skill of fence."

Doubtless there is very much of matter in this controversy which would be fairly categorized as intuitional, emotional, metaphysical, transcendental, progressional, and so forth. Indubitably, all the categories thus indicated, and perhaps a few more, have and must have their proper share in religion generally, in Christianity particularly. But I suspect and suggest that *these* are points correlative to what is ever the grand point, and has now become THE MOOT POINT.

Stated very simply, and rather too nakedly for minds that like truth to be clothed in dense embroidery of rhetoric, the salient point at issue would seem to be something very like this. And I would fain keep the topic as impersonal as possible. Those termed, wrongly or rightly, "of the Old school" urge that belief in miracle, especially in the miracle of Jesus Christ's personal and corporeal resurrection from the dead, *is indispensable* to the soundness and consistency of UNITARIAN, as well as of other, *Christianity;* and that the proper evidence of such miracle is, through eighteen centuries of confirmation, both historically and morally irrefragable. So their judgments and consciences are bound; but they would shrink from the risk of coercing others to this or any belief, and so leave all others, and beg to be left, free in the positive assertion of essential faith.

Those termed "of the New school" appear to demur to the foregone allegations in something like the sense following:—So far so good. But there *may be* proper Unitarian Christianity without a belief in the said miracle of Jesus Christ's resurrection,—nay, even without belief in miracle at all; and, further, the proof of resuscitation in the person of Jesus Christ, or indeed of any miracle whatsoever (even though we for our own parts may be assured of it), is *not* morally and historically "irrefragable."

Observe, neither side is taxed with contending that the proofs of miracle are *unassailable*. But one side avers that, how well or ill soever assailed, the *miraculous* fortress of FAITH remains impregnable; the other side concedes to opponents of its defences that it must now and then surrender at discretion.

These appear, Sir, not only to me, but to numerous bystanders, the distinct points of controversial attitude upon which the conflicting parties have, consciously or unconsciously, placed themselves before their friends, their foes and the public. The moot point between them is MIRACLE as an essential of Unitarian belief. Not forgetting or concealing that there are multitudinous intermediate positions on which the combatants ever and anon find themselves amidst the warmth of contest, I respectfully submit that the theological *Mincio* of Unitarian Christian tactics in this case flows distinctly and directly between the two positions above named. Alike the laity and the ministry that are not

immediately or officially engaged in the necessary strife of creed and Christian essentials of doctrine, look upon this as the vital or mortal stake at issue. Here appears the boundary-line which discriminates the *supernatural* accessaries of evidence as essentials or as non-essentials. Here arises, and will yet arise again and again, the question of theological, as there of political, *Unitarianism* according to the gospel severally accepted and interpreted: Can Italy be ONE till the moot point of essential trust is determined? And can Unitarian Christianity be ONE in basis, purpose and action, both at home and abroad, either as an ecclesiastical or a denominational entity and *identity*, until we can define in unambiguous language what it is as a mode of faith contradistinguished from Trinitarian or Arian or *Ultrarian* opinions on the one hand, and from uninspired, non-miraculous grounds of belief in God and Christ on the other? And let it be noted that INSPIRATION (whether of printing-presses, persons or pens) enters necessarily into the grand question of *miracle*. Once prove or hold that miracles are but legendary accretions upon historic phenomena, or are innocent, ignorant misrepresentations of pure and simple facts which can be philosophically substantiated better without than with *miracles*,—then divine inspiration according to the Scriptures, and especial utterances of prophecy as recorded under Moses and under Jesus, lose fame and name and claim.

The fact remains admitted on all hands that orthodox Christianity cannot be itself *without miracle*, special power of prophecy and inspiration being essential parts of *miraculous* proofs and credentials. The question that comes to be submitted for free and full (perhaps final?) discussion is, Can heterodox Christianity be itself without heartfelt belief in *miracle?* Is Unitarianism *Christian* according to the Scriptures, if it disbelieves miracle, or doubts whether Jesus Christ wrought miracles and himself rose from the dead? It is not for me to pronounce judgment; but, Sir, as I see and feel and think, there is not completely genuine gospel where *disbelief* of Jesus' resurrection is harboured, as also of his supernatural inspiration and that of his apostles John and James, Peter and Paul. But let the oracles declare.

S. C. FREEMAN.

Adelaide House, Highbury New Park, N., Nov. 12, 1859.

A CHURCHMAN ON THE PERSECUTIONS BY HIS CHURCH.

HAS not the Church of England any tale (of the spirit of intolerance) to tell? Was Cranmer free from all taint of connection with the fires of Smithfield? Was the reign of Elizabeth unblotted by any vile and paltry persecutions in which the sacred name of Christ was the password to compass the death of many helpless and innocent men? Was the Star Chamber of Charles I. unpolluted by the mole-like short-sightedness and bigotry of that persecuting prelate, Archbishop Laud, who thought to glorify his Church by maiming and disfiguring his fellow-creatures?—*Sermons by Rev. J. C. M. Bellew.*

CRITICAL NOTICES.

The New Almanacs.

THE Almanac is clearly an English want. The word itself is assigned by some etymologists to the Arabic, but others as confidently trace it to a Saxon origin (Almon-aght). Oxford had its Almanac-maker, one John Somer, as early as 1380. The first printed Almanac (Richard Pynson's in 1497) is one of the treasures over which a collector would expatiate with rapture. The "Year Books" go further back. There is one in the Lambeth Library (printed by Richard Tottell) which relates to the year 1344. Notwithstanding restrictions, first from a monopoly granted by James I. to the Stationers' Company, and next from a heavy government tax which existed till 1834, the circulation of Almanacs has always been very great. *Old Moore* used to sell 430,000 copies of his dreary trash. Now Almanacs are for the million, and are sold or even given in numbers beyond the power of estimate. The speculative tradesmen, the large vendor of quack medicines, slop-tailors, struggling newspaper proprietors, all make use of the Almanac as a means of attracting public attention. The abolition of monopoly and direct taxation has certainly led to the improvement of these annual guides to all sorts of useful and useless knowledge. It was said that nothing but monopoly kept the impostures of astrological and other predictions alive. But free trade in Almanacs has not yet put down this nuisance. We must trust to education to do this in the course of a generation or two.

Of the Almanacs for 1860, though last received, we will, as in duty bound, first notice the *Unitarian*. It comes out this year under better editorship than of old, and the improvement is marked. Its careful lists of congregations, ministers and institutions, will make it a necessity to all Unitarians who have transactions and correspondence on a large scale with the members of our religious denomination. A few errors have fallen under our notice in turning over the leaves. Why is "Wilmslow" given as the general designation of the two places at which Rev. John Colston ministers? He resides at Wilmslow, intermediate between Dean Row and Styal, but it is an error to describe either congregation or chapel as of Wilmslow. In the places of education assigned to ministers (pp. 28—30) some inaccuracies have crept in: e.g., Rev. Franklin Baker was not a York student, nor were Rev. John Cropper, Mr. G. P. Hinton, Rev. Henry Green, Rev. Noah Jones, Rev. G. H. Wells, Rev. Charles Wicksteed, indebted to that institution. The Rev. John Kenrick conferred unspeakable obligations on York College as its Classical Tutor, but he was an alumnus of Glasgow and at least one German University. But, on the other hand, York, not Glasgow, may claim the honour of having educated Dr. Hutton and Mr. Richard Shaen. The Rev. William Bowen was a student both at Glasgow and York. Rev. Jacob Brettell is called *John*, and Rev. J. C. Woods is named Rev. J. O. Woods. Rev. B. Carpenter, whose retirement from public duty through ill health all who know his worth must regret, was, we think, a pupil of Wymondly. Of him and others of "ministers not settled with any congregation" (viz., Rev. Charles Berry, Rev. H. H. Piper, Rev. W. Quinn and Rev. Edwin Smith, and perhaps one or two

others), the present address is wrongly given. A faultless annual we are not so unreasonable as to expect, but some of these errors might have been avoided. Eighteen congregations are reported as vacant, and about the same number are supplied by students or lay preachers. We think the enumeration of "Brighton" among the vacant congregations is an error, as, if we are not misinformed, Rev. Mr. Ainslie, formerly an Independent minister of considerable repute in London, is engaged to succeed Rev. J. P. Malleson, whose long-continued, able and gratuitous services at Brighton amply entitle him to honourable mention now that he retires from public duty.

The British and its thoughtful and instructive *Companion* deserve a place of honour in the enumeration of the best Almanacs of the year. To the *Companion*, Mr. Charles Knight contributes an excellent article on "The Necessity for Elementary Instruction in Political Economy." The follies perpetrated during 1859 by our workmen, and the dire miseries they have consequently brought on themselves and their families, give manifest importance to Mr. Knight's suggestions and his careful array of facts. We take the opportunity of directing the attention of the Trustees of Manchester New College to this subject. There was a time when Political Economy had its place in the curriculum of instruction. Our students and young ministers should know something of political economy if they are to take and to keep their rightful place in the discussion of public affairs. They can better spare three months of the metaphysical instruction which now, in the opinion of some of the friends of the College, occupies a disproportionate share of attention, than they can dispense with a knowledge of the results of economical science.—A paper on the National Debt shews how that millstone hanging round the neck of the country has grown from the time of William and Mary from 3 millions to 805 millions in the reign of Victoria. It is a document which shews expressively enough how costly the game of war is. The climax of our debt was reached in 1815. In the forty years of peace that followed, the debt was reduced by 92 millions. The wars that have subsequently broken out have increased the debt by 36 millions. The Necrological Table shews how rapidly our distinguished men are gliding away from us. During the year we have lost Hallam, Prescott, Humboldt, Brunel, Maltby, Nichol and Stephenson. The ages of forty deceased men of distinction are given, and indicate that mental work is not necessarily unfavourable to life, the average age attained being above 72. Of the forty, sixteen only died below 70 years, and nine reached to 80; three reached to 90.

The Illustrated London is wonderfully cheap, when the variety and beauty of its illustrations are considered. Natural history is, in both the text and the plates, a valuable characteristic of this Almanac.

Cassell's Illustrated, with its miserable woodcuts of war scenes in Italy, is cheap enough for its size, but in other respects not much entitled to praise.

"Francis Moore, Physician," still issues his *Vox Stellarum*, but wisely leaves much of the portentous nonsense that used to fill his pages to more modern astrological quacks. But there is still enough and to spare of this trash, mixed, however, with some really practical and useful knowledge.—It is not creditable to the intelligence of our country and age that *Zadkiel* sends forth the thirtieth, and *Raphael* the fortieth issue of

their startling but silly prognostics. The latter is one of the most costly of the Almanacs that strew our table.

The Protestant Dissenters' is also "a Political Annual." But neither in its denominational nor in its political intelligence is it reliable. It affects to give in its Dissenting Directory the places of worship in and around London, but makes no mention of Unitarian places. It affects to give Colleges and Educational Trusts, but makes no mention of Manchester College, University Hall and the Unitarian Home Missionary Board. It professes to give, however, a list of "Unitarian Trusts," but it is a mere copy of the list published a year ago in the Unitarian Almanac, and is now not accurate. The same remark applies to the particulars it affects to give of the Unitarian Association. It grossly blunders in a pretended list of Dissenting Members of Parliament. Mr. Bazley and Mr. Fox will stare to see themselves put into the same religious denomination, and *that* Unitarian. Of Unitarian Members, scarcely half are mentioned. It is clear that the *Protestant Dissenters'* Almanac wants an editor. The insertion of advertisements on the page, and the mingling of devotional thoughts with temporal matters, is not a convenient arrangement. Here our eye lights on pithy sentences on prayer, praise, conscience, &c., and there on "Children's Worm Tablets." The "Evangelical Pulpit" takes its place vis-à-vis to "South African Port," "Keating's Insect-destroying Powder," and similar delicacies.

The Original Baptist, though open to the criticism respecting the incongruous admixture of advertisements with incentives to piety, seems to be a cheap and useful organ of the religious denomination whose name it bears. The biographical sketches of deceased Baptist ministers are a good feature of this Almanac.

The Sunday-School Penny Magazine.

We desire once more to call the attention of our friends to this useful and well-conducted little periodical. It is very judiciously adapted to the taste and comprehension of the class of persons for whose benefit it is published, and at the same time is characterized by a high moral and religious tone, and is both instructive and amusing. The editorship has passed from the hands of Rev. John Wright to Rev. Alfred W. Worthington, of Mansfield, for whom we desire an editorial career as satisfactory as that of his predecessor.

The Holy Spirit: its Nature and Work. By Rev. John Montgomery. Pp. 16. Belfast—Greer.

This is a scriptural and sensible sermon on a subject on which some of our preachers and speakers now-a-days run very wild, forgetting alike scripture and common sense. It was preached before the Remonstrant Synod of Ulster at the time that the fanatical movement called a Revival was at its height. If our English friends who apologize for revivals would think less of their theories on the work of the Spirit and look a little more at facts, they would probably regard the unanimous condemnation of the recent religious ferment by our Irish Unitarian friends as a circumstance well entitled to consideration.

INTELLIGENCE.

CHINA AND ITS PEOPLE.

Sir John Bowring lately read to the Society of Arts an interesting and instructive paper on this subject, from which we take the concluding portion, as reported in the Journal of the Society of Arts. We cannot refrain from adding the remark, that the English nation is much indebted to Sir John Bowring for his able services in China in circumstances of peculiar difficulty. This is, we doubt not, the prevailing impression, notwithstanding the efforts of Tory politicians to blacken the public character of our excellent countryman. Their misrepresentations are put forth in the hope of making political capital for themselves out of what they call the blundering policy of the Government from which he received his instructions.

"The Chinese have a character of industry, to be found not only in no part of the oriental, but, I believe, in no part of the western world. I came back to this country and found a great struggle going on between the masters and the workmen upon the question of reducing ten hours a day of labour to nine, for which the same liberal wages were to be paid. There are hundreds of thousands of Chinese who would be glad to toil 16 hours a day if they could only get paid for it. The Chinese are essentially a people of an industrious, persevering, sober and economical character. I have said that millions of that people leave their own country for other lands, but in every instance it is with the hope of returning to it again. No women are allowed to accompany them out of the country; such is their unfortunate condition; for so stringent is the law in China as to the exit of women, that it would not protect the clan from the vengeance of its neighbours if they consented that any of its females should abandon the land of their fathers. I was myself applied to by one of the most opulent Chinamen of Java, who would have been willing to have paid £30,000 or £40,000 to have obtained permission for his young wife to join him there. I did my best to augment the domestic felicity of the parties, but I failed. That is only one of many similar instances in which I have been applied to; but it is impossible, by any pecuniary inducement, to obtain the consent of the clan to the departure of a single Chinese woman out of the country.

"That reverence for ancestors — that desire of being interred amongst the shades of their progenitors, is so universal, that we have sometimes had in Hong-Kong an arrival of vessels, not charged with human bones, but laden with coffins of Chinese, sent from California and Australia, to be buried in the locality where reposed the remains of their progenitors. I took some pains to ascertain how long the Chinese ordinarily lived in foreign countries, and I found that, upon an average, in five years they were enabled to return with savings amounting to about 200 dollars. I visited the island of Banca, where the whole working of the mines is in the hands of the Chinese; and the governor of the place informed me that every year 5000 of the Chinese arrived to replace the same number who left, and who, in the space of time I have mentioned, had acquired a little independence, returned to their country, and purchased land with the money. I do not know whether I have mentioned the fact that in this vast population of China there are not more than 500 or 600 different clans; and that although it may be that very few labouring men in England can tell the names of their grandfathers, there is scarcely a man in China, however low his position, who cannot trace back his pedigree for many generations. This leads me to mention a singular usage which prevails in the nobility of China,—they reckon upwards, that is to say, if a man distinguishes himself in his youth, and is made a duke, his father would be a marquis, his grandfather an earl, and his great-grandfather a baron, and so on as far as they could follow his history. The theory of that is, that they do not know what a man's children may be, but they know what his forefathers have been, and the state is quite safe in conferring honours upon the deserving and those who trained them.

"With reference to education in China, the competitive system universally exists. It is intended that no man shall hold office who has not undergone a previous examination, and who has not worked his way through the different halls to a certain literary position. There is no distinction in this respect between rich and poor, and some of the most eminent men in that country have risen from very low origins. Commissioner Lin, whose name is so familiar to you all, was a maker of artificial flowers in his boyhood, as his father was before him. The present head of the Han Lin College, which is the highest of university establishments, was the son of a humble shopkeeper in Ningpo. He was brought up and educated in a mean street,

where his father kept a small stationer's shop. He was very successful in the different grades of examination; he obtained the various degrees which are accessible to the Chinese; he reached the Han Lin College, and afterwards became its president. I happen to know something of the honours done to his family. His father, mother and grandmother received the felicitations of the whole nobility, dignitaries and great functionaries of the district, at the honour attained by their son. You must suppose the small number who attain to that degree of eminence, when I mention the fact that in the province of Kwangtung there are 20,000,000 of inhabitants, and that there, after the various examinations are gone through, the number who go to Canton, when the literary examiner comes there once in three years, to be competitors in the triennial examinations, varies from 7000 to 9000. Amongst these are young children and old men. There are cases of men 70 or 80 years of age, who have been struggling all through their life to obtain some public appointment, who go into the examinations and perish under the effort; for there is scarcely an examination at Canton in which several of the students do not die from the extreme excitement and exertion. Of these thousands of competitors only 72 can be selected for the honours awarded.

"The misfortune of China is that she is so stationary. If her educational machinery were fed with proper knowledge, it would make China not only one of the most progressive, but one of the most influential countries in the world. But unfortunately, in China, every man looks to the past: he finds no wisdom but in the days gone by. He swears by his ancestors. You may discuss with a Chinese the absurdity of his astronomical system, and he will argue by saying—'You people of the West are a very absurd people. You talk about the earth moving round the sun, when your common sense should convince you, when you walk out in the morning, that the sun rises in the east and goes down in the west; and yet you are perverse enough to say that the sun stands still and the earth moves round it.' You employ a series of reasonings against his theory; you prove that the same results must happen if the earth moves round the sun as are produced, in his idea, by the sun's moving round the earth; and you urge that there are many things which are not explicable under his theory, and the answer you get is, 'But the sages say that the sun moves round the earth;' and in that way you are dumb-foundered.

"Looking into the early history of China, I find that 4000 years ago the art of draining was thoroughly understood, that mountains were levelled, that valleys were raised, and that agriculture was carried on in a state of perfection, beyond which it has not progressed a step. I find that 2200 years before Christ, the Chinese people were clad in silk; and there is a very ancient proverb which says it is an opprobrium to a man who, having reached the age of fifty, does not possess a silk garment. I lately stumbled upon a passage in a history of the second century, in which I found a description of the manufacture of paper in all its detail, from rags reduced to pulp, and which, by pressure, were made to give a paper upon which the Chinese were in the habit of writing, while it is notorious that in Europe the manufacture of paper was contemporaneous with the invention of printing, and, perhaps, more important than the invention of printing itself in the advancement of civilisation. Many of the discoveries which are modern in Europe are ancient in China. It is impossible to say when the Chinese had *not* the printing art. The mariner's compass, it is notorious, was possessed by them hundreds and hundreds of years before we had any knowledge of it. There is a description even of iron boats and rotatory paddles at a remote period. Every one knows of what antiquity is their beautiful porcelain. So far from progression, I am sorry to say that these arts are in a state of decadence in China, and the value of porcelain is now estimated by its age. In consequence of some porcelain having been found either in the Pyramids or in the ruins adjacent to them, it was maintained that there must have been intercourse between China and Egypt, and that these, bearing as they do undoubtedly Chinese inscriptions, and being filled with cosmetics or perfumes, or with the valuable produce of the East, contained evidence of the existence not only of the Chinese language three or four thousand years ago, but of intimate relations between India and China. The fact led to investigation, and we were enabled to trace in the poets of China every inscription that was found upon these curious porcelain jars; and this shewed that they could not have had an earlier existence than the period at which these poets lived, which was between the eighth and the tenth centuries,—certainly a very curious and not uninteresting fact.

"While I feel how much backwardness there is in China, and that in many matters there is a great deal to learn, I know that we might communicate to them much very valuable knowledge. The only in-

stance in which, so far as I know, they have generally adopted the improvements of the West, is in the general use of fire-engines, which are found in many of the principal cities in China, and which are worked with very great activity and dexterity. China, I think, might teach us something in other matters. In a collection that I made for the town of Sheffield, it was discovered that they had the art, I believe wholly unknown in Europe, of hardening brass to the consistency of steel; and there are brass instruments made in China at this moment of exceeding delicacy, that have all the power which we give to steel. I think also that something is to be learnt in the chemical field of inquiry. Many of the colours of China are very superior to those of Europe. There is one colour which has led to some curious investigations, namely, a perfect vegetable green. They have a green indigo, which is a permanent colour. Now I believe up to the present time we have never been able to make a green which will resist all the changes of temperature and climate. I have suggested, on two or three occasions, when I have had the opportunity of giving advice, that it is exceedingly important, now that China is likely to be opened to European inquiries, that intelligent persons should be sent there, in order to see whether, from the experience of these forty centuries, something might not be gathered up that is of practical value. Intercourse may lead to the removal of many of their prejudices, but without that intercourse it is impossible to alter the stereotyped character of the Chinese. They treat us with disdain, and often with perfidy; but they are all educated under the idea that we are no better than 'barbarians,' and that we ought to be dealt with as if we were wild beasts. Such are the teachings of their philosophers, who represent that the world is divided into two great portions, that its centre is under the canopy of Heaven—the ordinary name which they give to their country—all civilization being under this canopy, and that besides this there is the barbarism which is beyond. We represent that barbarism; and in discussing the matter with the Chinese, they say, 'You are great fighters; you have attended to the art of war, and we have not; but you have no civilization; you have no language that is intelligible. It is true, you are taught to write; but then we see a man who comes from a nation of three or four millions of people, and on the other side of the water there is another nation of three or four millions, and the writing of the man on one side of the river is given to a man on the other side of the river, and he cannot make out a word of it.' They say, 'We are three or four hundred millions of people, who cannot, indeed, understand one another's talk, but everybody understands what everybody writes.' I never found a Chinaman embarrassed when he met a man from a distant province, for though their spoken idioms are different, their written signs are identical. Failing to be understood in speech, the Chinaman makes a mark on his hand, and he is understood immediately. The Chinese often taunt us with the imperfection of our education and the narrow scope of our language, and in this respect deem us inferior to the natives of Japan, Corea or Siam, who can read the Chinese character."

UNITARIANISM IN ADELAIDE, SOUTH AUSTRALIA.

The fourth annual meeting of the members of the Unitarian Christian church in this colony was held in their place of worship in Wakefield Street, on Tuesday evening, the 4th inst., A. Hardy, Esq., in the chair. The Treasurer's accounts shewed their funds to be in a flourishing state, and by a lengthy report of the Committee of Management it appeared that great unanimity had existed in the congregation during the past year, and that though their number was still small, it was on the increase, and that as their opinions and the principles they advocated became better known, they were beginning to excite the sympathy and respect of a great portion of the liberal Christians of other denominations. The proceedings were enlivened by the choir, which executed in a very masterly style several pieces of sacred music. Their pastor, the Rev. J. C. Woods, B.A., delivered a very eloquent address on 'The Difficulties, Defects, Encouragements and Duties of Unitarian Christians in sustaining their Relation to a True Theology, and a high Religious Life.' He descanted at some length on the difficulties and defects arising necessarily from his isolated position, but he was encouraged by his own settled conviction, supported by the best popular literature of the present day, that a more liberal spirit with regard to religious matters was beginning to manifest itself. He quoted from the *Press*, an Evangelical newspaper, an article confirmatory of his statement, and remarked that an immense amount of injury had resulted to Christianity from the too literal interpretation of the Scriptures. He exhorted his hearers to imbibe their spirit, and remarked that the question of literal interpretation in geology, for example, had

been long since settled on the minds of thinking men of all classes, who pointed to the truths written on the rocks by the finger of Almighty God as their guide. The Rev. gentleman concluded his address (which was listened to with marked attention) by impressing upon his hearers the advantages that would accrue to them, both here and hereafter, by following the precepts and example of Jesus Christ, and assured them that nothing would prove so well the efficacy of their faith as the purity of their lives. The Hon. C. Davies, Hon. H. Ayers, Mr. W. Kay, and several other members, addressed the meeting on matters connected with the church and with the general principles and prospects of Christian Unitarians; and the company separated evidently well pleased with the evening's instructive entertainment.

The above is taken from the "Christian Advocate," published at Adelaide, Oct. 15, 1859. The same paper contains several articles that shew the working of Unitarian arguments on the religious mind of Australia. Defences of our opinions appear in the pages of this periodical from the pen of laymen. We have also lately received proofs of the fidelity of our Unitarian brother, Rev. J. C. Woods, who is set for the defence of the gospel at our antipodes, in two well-argued pamphlets, the first a lecture on the "Divinity of Christ," in reply to a pamphlet bearing that title; the second, entitled "Unitarian Christianity scriptural as well as reasonable."

UPPER BROOK-STREET CHAPEL, MANCHESTER.

On Sunday, Dec. 18th, a meeting of the congregation was held in the chapel after morning service, for the purpose of considering the passing of a valedictory resolution on the occasion of the departure of the Rev. J. H. Hutton, whose resignation was accepted a few months ago.

The meeting was very numerously attended, nearly every member of the congregation remaining. After some preliminary statements, a resolution was moved and carried unanimously to the effect, that the members of the congregation desired, before the Rev. J. H. Hutton had actually left them, to express to him their grateful sense of the faithfulness and devotion of his pastorate amongst them; to assure him that, admiring and honouring the courage of his avowal of the change, which had separated him from them, in his position with regard to that spiritual life which they had learned from him more anxiously to desire, they heartily sympathized with him in all his sacrifices for conscience' sake; and, with earnest wishes and prayers for the health and happiness of himself and those dearest to him, affectionately bade him farewell and God-speed; and they requested his acceptance of their parting gift as a small token of personal regard.

It was stated that this gift amounted to something over £315; and the meeting requested that it should be handed to the Rev. gentleman by a deputation, along with a copy of the resolution, signed by the Chairman in the name of the society.

SOIREE AT CHESTERFIELD.

The annual social meeting of the congregation assembling in the Elder-Yard Unitarian chapel, Chesterfield, was held in the large Sunday-school-room on Tuesday evening, Dec. 6th. In addition to the usual display of evergreens and flowers, the room was tastefully decorated with a number of paintings and engravings lent for the occasion. On the wall at the head of the room was the recently published portrait of the late Rev. Charles Wellbeloved, and near it that of the late Christopher Rawdon, Esq. Upwards of 250 adults sat down to tea, and the number was afterwards increased to about 300. Several ministers of the neighbouring towns and a party of friends from Sheffield were present.

Rev. FRANCIS BISHOP, minister of the congregation, was called to the chair, and addressed the meeting in a hopeful and encouraging strain on the state of the congregation and its various institutions.

Rev. A. W. WORTHINGTON, B.A., of Mansfield, gave a long and able address on Christian union.

Mr. THOMAS WOODHEAD, an old and much-respected member of the congregation, spoke of the great responsibilities and duties of lay-members of Christian churches.

Rev. J. J. BISHOP, B.A., of Loughborough, spoke on the inestimable value and the sufficiency of the Scriptures, when rightly used, as a guide to faith.

Rev. R. L. LLOYD, of Belper, gave an address on Home Missions.

Rev. T. R. ELLIOTT, of Ilkeston, recently a Baptist minister at Market Harborough, spoke on the duty and blessedness of obeying conscience.

Mr. GOODWIN made some remarks on the following sentiment: "Long continuance and increasing usefulness to our congregational social meetings; may they more and more conduce to cherish feelings of Christian love among ourselves and towards all our brethren of mankind."

Rev. Brooke Herford, of Sheffield, spoke eloquently and earnestly on the duty incumbent on all bodies of Christians to work zealously for the diffusion of a high tone of religious thought and action among the people.

Many pieces of music were sung by the choir in the course of the evening, and at about ten o'clock the proceedings, which had lasted five hours, were brought to a close by singing and prayer.

CONGREGATIONAL SOCIAL MEETING.

On the evening of Tuesday, Dec. 20th, the members of the Unitarian church, Hackney, held their second annual social meeting. The school-room was on this occasion tastefully fitted up, and presented the combinations of a well-furnished drawing-room, a picture gallery and a museum. The walls were decorated with pictures and engravings. Amongst the former was a fine painting by Mr. Chester Earles of the group at the foot of the Cross; amongst the former were the portraits of many Unitarian worthies, not without distinguished men of other churches. The tables were covered with works of art, objects of vertù, &c. The gathering of friends, notwithstanding the intensity of the cold, was sufficiently large to fill the room. The principal amusement of the evening was music, vocal and instrumental, the latter by Mrs. Hale, the accomplished organist and conductress of the choir. The ladies and gentlemen of the congregation who compose the choir gave a series of beautiful glees, madrigals and songs. All the forms of a public meeting were avoided, except during a few minutes, when the chair was taken by the pastor of the church, who spoke a few sentences expressive of his feelings towards Mr. J. E. Clennell (the indefatigable treasurer of the congregation) and his lady, by whom all the arrangements for the meeting had been made. Mr. Venning then addressing Mr. Clennell, congratulated him on the happy and prosperous state of the congregation, for which they were greatly indebted to his admirable conduct as the principal secular officer of the church. They had been brought in safety through a period of great difficulty and anxiety. The congregation, in token of their appreciation of Mr. Clennell's services, now through him (Mr. Venning) desired his acceptance of a gold chronometer watch. Mr. D. A. Gibbs seconded Mr. Venning's remarks in a brief and cordial address. Mr. Clennell acknowledged the gift in a very feeling manner, and afterwards spoke in terms of affectionate appreciation of the pastor of their church. Refreshments were served during the evening in one of the lower school-rooms. A pleasant feature of the meeting was the mingling of young and old (for there were many of the children of the flock), and also the happy union of the several classes of which the congregation is composed. Good taste and kindness ruled in all the intercourses of the evening, and so happy was the celebration that it was nearly midnight before the last groups of friends left the rooms.—We are glad to hear also of social meetings of the Essex-Street and Kentish-Town congregations.

RAGGED SCHOOLS AND THE PROPOSED "REVIVAL."

We observe, not without regret, that an attempt is about to be made to get up the hot steam of the Ulster Revival in connection with the Ragged Schools of the metropolis. At meetings of the Ragged School delegates, held on Nov. 16 and Nov. 30, it was determined to get up an aggregate meeting of all the Ragged School teachers of London, "for the purpose of calling their prayerful attention to the revival of religion." In conformity with this resolution, the Committee of the Ragged School Union have called a meeting to be held in St. Martin's Hall, Long Acre, on Thursday, Jan. 5. It is then proposed to set to work the machinery, so well understood by religious agitators, for producing that disordered state of mind and feeling which is so ill described by the terms "Revival of Religion." Religion, we believe, has nothing to do with the noise and tumultuous excitement of such artificial explosions of sound and feeling. But never was a scheme less promising of useful results than this of enticing the poor and neglected little children of the streets and alleys of the metropolis to join in the wild extravagances of the so-called Revival. That some of the children will be terrified is probable enough; that others will laugh at the whole thing is not unlikely; but that respect for religion, or a better understanding of the duties they owe to God and man, will result from this scheme, we cannot believe. On the other hand, we are not without apprehension of direct evils from this attempt to introduce the fanaticism lately prevalent in Ulster into these institutions of charity. Judicious friends, both in and out of the church, will be alarmed, and may drop their subscriptions; and at all events the attention and labour of the teachers who are drawn into the vortex of the stream will be diverted from their useful duties to take their part in a scheme of more than doubtful good. The second week in January is

the time fixed for the attempt to work on the nerves of the London public. The teachers and officers of Ragged Schools are invited at that time to attend a series of eight Revival meetings, to be held chiefly on successive evenings in various places in the city and other metropolitan districts. This extension of the Revival agitation is in part the consequence of the want of courage of religious men in withstanding what they know to be evil, or what they do not know to be good. It is an ill sign that, for the first time in its history, English Unitarianism has declined to give an unanimous rebuke to this outbreak of disordered zeal. Some persons amongst us seem flattered by the approving notice of Unitarians recently taken by orthodox critics. We would warn them to distrust these gifts. They cannot by an abandonment of a rational position really conciliate any considerable portion of that which calls itself the religious world, but they may put back the clock of religious reformation, and deprive us, as a religious denomination, of the respect and confidence of thoughtful and moderate men of all parties.

REFORM OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

Lord Ebury's efforts to form and combine a sound and strong public opinion on this subject, seems to be alarming zealous Churchmen, both high and low, and a manifesto is now receiving the signatures of mulitudinous Puseyite and Evangelical clergymen, denouncing the movement of Lord Ebury and his supporters as pregnant with danger to the Church. Lord Ebury informs the readers of the *Times* (Dec. 27), that he has been likened by a clerical correspondent of the *Guardian* to Ahab. He also publishes a letter from a Shropshire clergyman (Rev. Daniel Nihil, rector of Fitz), who shews that many bishops and clergymen disapprove of some things contained in the Book of Common Prayer, and proceeds to say, "The Act of Uniformity imposes a solemn declaration, in the nature of an oath, upon every clergyman that he does from his heart fully assent and consent, not to the general excellence of the compilation, but to 'all and everything therein contained and prescribed,' including of necessity, every inaccuracy, inconsistency and blemish." He asserts that this is to many conscientious clergymen a heavy burthen, and expresses his wonder at the manifesto now being circulated which seeks to retain the book with all its faults. "If this be right," he adds, "in the sight of God, judge ye. I profess that it shocks my sense of truth, of candour and of consistency." Until clergymen who think this dare to carry their protest into action, and quit a Church which thus tyrannically extorts a confession of faith in inconsistency and errors, there will be little disposition in the English Hierarchy to grant the demanded reforms.

SUCCESSFUL RESISTANCE TO INTENDED ORTHODOX SPOLIATION IN THE LAW COURTS OF AMERICA.

We have for several numbers wished to find space for the following interesting particulars, which we extract from the *Boston Christian Examiner* for September, 1859. We rejoice that the bigots in America have been less successful than were the relators in the Hewley suit in this country.

"The highest court of New Hampshire has just made a very interesting decision. Almost forty years since, the Rev. (now Dr.) L. W. Leonard took the pastoral charge of the only church and society in Dublin, under the shadow of the Monadnock, then a place of far humbler pretensions than now. His settlement was an era in the cause of common-school education, to which he gave himself with a special zeal. It was shewn by the preparation of several popular treatises or textbooks in its aid; by a steady and vigilant personal supervision of the teachers and the taught in the districts of his cure; by creating, in fact (since in that day the name was hardly known), a Sabbath-school library, whose spreading fame made it the prototype of institutions of the sort, and the number of whose volumes distanced everything of the kind near or far. The much more than average intelligence of Dublin was conceded on all sides, and became a sort of proverb. Dr. Leonard was the successor of a gentleman who was unmarried, not dependent on his salary alone, while his wants, naturally enough, were very circumscribed. The end of his ministry found him, therefore, in easy, one might almost say, for a retired country pastor, affluent circumstances; his property then rating at five to six thousand dollars. His affections were wrapt up in those for whom he laboured; there were none, by legal title or the sentiment of society to divert his bounty elsewhere; and the Congregational Society became, almost as a thing of course, his only legatee. For very many years Dr. Leonard built up in the faith and order of the Gospel an undivided township. But in our age, and especially in this land, who expects such a condition to be enduring?

The wonder now is at the rare examples, of which that spoken of was one, of its lengthened date. Discontent based on doctrinal grounds made entrance at last; though it is past all doubt that their unity would have held unbroken much longer, if their convictions and sense of duty had been left in their own keeping. But those faithful overseers of a man's flock, his brethren around, are seldom wanting to their supposed duty in the case; and here, as elsewhere, those who had been taught they were aggrieved, were allowed no rest till they found it in secession and a new altar. But their numbers were few; their fortunes certainly at no time bright; and the pulpit changed its incumbent with a most discouraging frequency. All at once a happy remedy to meet the exigency, and revive the dying-out light in this candlestick of true gold, was started by somebody,—by whom we know not, but where that credit rests, should by all means be traced out. The bequest of which we have spoken had been made to 'the Congregational Society of the place;' and now the quite original idea was, to dispute the title of the mother society to be styled 'Congregational' at all. Who could have encouraged these hopes, that were (or rather should have been) competent to advise, remains in the dark; but the hopes themselves waxed stronger, till they issued in the final appeal—to the law. The trial came on last winter, and before a full bench: the hearing filled many days; and seriously, the plea most strenuously insisted upon for the transfer of the property to the new claimants was, that the keepers of it did not accept the Assembly's Catechism! Certain points technically legal, and which waited for a law term to be fully considered, deferred the final decision almost to the month of July, now just passed. It was the unanimous judgment of the court, that the plaintiffs had wholly failed to establish their position; and we ought to add, that four of the five judges were kindred in theological relations with those whom they thus dismissed. The Chief Justice incidentally spoke of himself as a member of the old (orthodox) church at Concord (Dr. Bouton's).

"The documents comprising this case are just published, and their extent causes one to break out in wonder over the subtilties of a science, by which a proposition, to common view so simple, can become so complicated. The opinion of the presiding judge took up three hours in the delivery. The testimony of the Rev. Dr. Lamson, of Dedham, whose ministerial experience, on its very threshold, was such as to be fruitful of questions pertinent to the point in hand, kept him on the stand the larger part of a week, inflicting on the outer man what, in homely dialect, is often called a *siege*.

"The documents of the Dublin case shew how distressfully earnest the counsel for the plaintiffs were to make out that it was never conceived with us to have the radical meaning of Independent, so wisely preferred in the mother country by those in whose fellowship they gloried. Early authorities to this effect are paraded and lengthened out; and even, one is ashamed to say, some of the present time; for example, Professor Upham, of Brunswick. It would be descending to bandy words in such an argument. All this unwearied painstaking but serves to shew how little, with the large body of those who are most intent to usurp control over the appellation which is the nucleus of this debate, the vital essence of the one thing or the other is to their taste or after their heart; as to which, we reserve a further word to be spoken in the sequel.

"The motive for these endeavours after a monopoly of a denominational name, thus steadily kept in view through long years, and which must be deemed a thing of concert through almost the whole line of a party, is altogether hid from us. Where the dear rights of property are concerned indeed, an explanation is found for almost anything. And yet even in the Dublin question (coming within that category), it is a very partial explanation. The plaintiffs had had no funds wrested from them by the strong arm. The case widely differs, as any one must see, from those of a minority in church, being conjoined with a majority of the parish, constituting, in the successive judgments of the courts, that body the first church, and which was the essence of the Dedham, Princeton and Groton suits in Massachusetts. These last may naturally enough be counted a hard, and, in more than one sense, a trying case. But the claimants in the matter in hand lost nothing which they did not lose by their own act and consent; and now strive to recover, not only their own share of a common good, but the whole. This only will content them. We repeat, then, one cannot but wonder that the zeal of these voluntary New Hampshire confessors was so impetuous, or their simplicity so extreme, as to allow them to have been committed beyond retreat to a lawsuit. That it was a very small society, would seem less a reason for precipitancy than the contrary. We profess to know nothing; but cannot but suspect that those whose friendly offices were at first astir to make this little

flock feel it their solemn duty to secede and build, have added to this obligation by inciting to another step, which has plunged their clients still more deeply in debt. The orthodoxy more nearly round about us, however actively bent in the same direction, is more cunning; conscious that the process of 'continual dropping' on paper or on the stone is the safest way, though it makes a slow approach enough to its object. This has been probably the first lawsuit to deprive Unitarian believers of the Congregational name; the second will not probably come in our time."

STOCKPORT UNITARIAN CHURCH.

For some time past the handsome Unitarian church at Stockport has laboured under a burthen of debt which has to a serious extent cramped its operations. A committee of ladies was, however, formed, by whose untiring exertions the whole of this debt, amounting to £2100, has been at length removed, and on Tuesday, Dec. 20, a congratulatory meeting of the members of the congregation and their friends was held in the school-room connected with the church to celebrate the happy event. Mr. HENRY COPPOCK presided. In his opening address he paid a well-deserved tribute to the exertions of the ladies, and expressed his satisfaction at the connection which the congregation had lately formed with his friend, Rev. A. Creery. His services had been most acceptable, and, he was sure, had given great satisfaction. The Chairman concluded by calling on Mr. Creery to address the meeting, and gave the following as the sentiment upon which he would speak—"The Ladies of this Congregation, through whose successful efforts this congregation has been relieved from a debt which cramped its energies and destroyed its vitality. May the thanks of this meeting, their own approving consciences, and the future prosperity of the church, be a lasting remembrance that they have therein nobly done their duty."

Rev. A. CREERY, after some appropriate remarks on behalf of those energetic ladies of the congregation who had by their exertions succeeded in clearing the church from debt, said—When he came to this congregation it was to him delightful to think and to feel that he should breathe the air of liberty, that he had come amongst men whose only desire was to promote freedom of thought in the world. Now, it was no small boast to be able to say they had a church which was free from superstition. Theology, apart from the superstition of the dark ages, was not popular at the present day; but they professed that their church was of such a nature that it could defy even the beams of the mid-day sun. He believed, however, that a brighter and a better day was dawning upon them; he saw now, behind those mountains whose huge forms had so long obscured the rays, beams of light rising, which gave great courage and heart to hope for better things. In the Established Church at the present day there were numbers of men who were doing the work of illumination, and he delighted to see them there. The powers were now at work which would compel all men ere long to roll the chariot of freedom across the world; but in the mean time it was their duty to raise up beacons of light to point out the way to the land of liberty. In this work the ladies of the congregation had been engaged, and they had nobly succeeded. In after times, when all that were now in that room were gathered to their long homes, and when pure Christianity shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea—the men of those times would point to that church and say, The men who erected that building were, at all events, true prophets of their time, and by their labours have done a great deal to the spread of religious liberty and truth throughout the world. On behalf of the ladies, he begged leave to thank them for the manner in which they had recognized their services.

Rev. CHARLES BEARD, in speaking to the sentiment of "Home Missionary Endeavour," said—It had been truly observed by Mr. Coppock, that the Unitarian body was beginning to shake off its lethargy with regard to home missionary labour, but it was not for him to inquire into the reasons which had prevented their predecessors from undertaking that labour. It would, however, be very far from true to say that the work had been wholly neglected. There had been many men—amongst whom he might mention his own father—who, throughout the whole of their ministerial course had kept this object steadily in view, and done very good and hard work in the same direction in which they were now proceeding. Those works had not been carried out in former times for want of being seconded by the congregations of Lancashire and Cheshire; but now the attempt was being made to do all in their power in this respect. He was not one of those persons who thought that in times to come all the different sects of religionists would be merged into one, and that Unitarianism, being the strongest of them all, was the one sect which was to govern the world. That was

not the principle upon which they ought to engage in the missionary work. If a man believed that he had in his possession truths which are effectual comforters,—if he thought that these truths relieved him from superstitious fears, and supplied him with the necessary moral and spiritual food for his soul, would bring him into the presence of his God far more surely than any other,—if he felt that he had the spirit of God within him testifying to the truth he possessed,—why then he had no choice; he could not help but go forth and spread that truth. It was with these feelings they should undertake the missionary work, not with any view of producing a particular impression upon other men's minds, but because God had placed within them something precious, which, like all God's gifts, was to be distributed to the whole world. Religious life should produce missionary work; it was not for missionary work to produce religious life. The beginning of their work must be a well-spring within themselves, and the actual expression of that religious life, of that spirit of missionary labour, that was within them. Mr. Beard concluded an able speech by alluding in detail to the mode of operation resorted to in the various chapels of Lancashire and Cheshire employed in the missionary work, and described the division of labour.

Rev. JOHN GORDON spoke on "The prospects of Free Theology in the present day." After congratulating the Unitarians of Stockport on the advantageous circumstances in which they were placed, he said that whatever the prospects of the liberal theology of the present day might be, they ought to make no difference to the discharge of the high religious responsibilities under which they lay. However dark those prospects might be, it ought not to restrain them from the discharge of those duties they were called upon to perform; but ought, on the contrary, to call forth greater carefulness and earnestness on their part. They had a certain truth entrusted to them, which was a most precious possession, and they were bound by every moral and religious feeling, and by every other obligation under which they lay, to do their duty in spreading and upholding this truth, regardless of all consequences, leaving the future entirely in the hands of Him by whose wisdom and goodness they believed all future events would be overruled. The prospects of liberal theology were very favourable; they saw on all sides an advance towards these principles, not merely in their own community, but in almost every religious community on which they could set their eyes. Within the last twenty years a great change in theology had taken place, and that change had not been in any instance towards a narrow theology, but towards a more liberal one. Whatever progress had been made in other religious communities had been in direct opposition to the views of Christianity to which the parties making it had subscribed. In almost every instance the progress of liberal theology had placed the minister and the congregation in opposition, not merely to the opinions they formerly held, but to the opinions with which they were identified by positive bargain to that effect. But the result of this was very disastrous indeed in its bearing upon the religion of the case, but still more so upon its morality. The moral view of this subject was of more importance than the religious one, inasmuch as it was more dangerous. A man who subscribed himself to that which he did not believe, or who continued his subscription since his belief had undergone a change, approached very near to dishonesty. To connect religion with any dishonesty, either in principle or feeling, was to bring the whole question of religion into discredit.—There was an idea prevailing that the administration of religion was entirely entrusted to the parsons. A falser idea than this could not exist, for a minister could do nothing unless he was upheld by the members of his congregation. They must be religious men. Not merely Unitarians—free men, men attached to a liberal theology, but men cultivating in their hearts, their minds, and all their relations to society in general, a true and really religious character. If they proved that Unitarianism made them better men in all the varied relations of life, they might depend upon it they would succeed, and that their body would prosper.

Rev. G. H. WELLS spoke on "The Unitarian Church," and Mr. GRINDEN on "The universality of the Christian spirit." A vote of thanks was passed to the Chairman, and the meeting terminated with singing and prayer.

A MARKED SIGN OF THE TIMES.

The congregation which was founded in Strasburg by Calvin, has just appointed as its pastor the Rev. T. Colani, editor of the very liberal *Nouvelle Revue de Théologie*, author of the truly excellent volume of sermons which Dr. Davidson proposes to translate, and who, more than any other person, may be called the leader of the great religious movement which is Unitarianizing the French Protestant Church, and gradually sapping the foundations of the Catholic Church not in France only, but in neighbouring countries.

OBITUARY.

Oct. 4, at Gloucester, of pulmonary consumption, FANNY, the affectionate wife of Mr. J. Pascoe BLIGH, aged 26 years. Few individuals ever spent life more usefully, or relinquished it more tranquilly, or with the indulgence of brighter hope.

Oct. 28, at Abbey Mead, Tavistock, Mr. JOHN COMMINS, at the advanced age of 84. He was born in Tavistock, where he afterwards spent, with the exception of a few years, the whole period of his earthly lifetime; and long as that was, it was filled with deeds of goodness and marked throughout by an earnest Christian zeal. He was early left an orphan, and brought up under the care of an affectionate uncle. Several of the best years of his life were spent under the tuition of his venerable pastor, the Rev. Theophilus Edwards, afterwards of Exeter. By means of subsequent study and an earnest self-culture, Mr. Commins acquired considerable proficiency as a linguist.

He was originally destined for the medical profession, but in consequence of his extreme sensitiveness was obliged to relinquish it. His sympathies strongly inclined him at one time to entertain serious views of entering the Unitarian Academy, then at Exeter, with the intention of qualifying himself for the Unitarian ministry, to which he was strongly urged by his friend Mr. Kentish; but domestic circumstances prevented his carrying out this object, which he seemed in later years exceedingly to regret. What he had thus failed of attaining himself, he secured for his eldest son, Mr. Joseph Rowe Commins, who passed through the usual course of instruction at Manchester College, York, with much credit; but as he was about to enter upon a most promising ministry at Lincoln, he was mysteriously summoned to a more heavenly ministry on high, having been borne to his final rest at the early age of twenty-three.

But though Mr. Commins was not specially qualified for the Unitarian ministry by a preparatory course of collegiate theological education, yet he possessed all the natural aptitude for it which could be derived from a richly stored and a highly cultivated mind, and, above all, from a heart singularly devout and deeply religious; and he did accordingly conduct the services at the Abbey chapel, Tavistock, for a considerable time when the congregation was not supplied with a settled minister. At all times he was ready, even in the last year of his life, to occupy the pulpit upon any emergency; and for many past years he always read the hymns given out in the course of the services, with a fervour and impressiveness which those who had the privilege of hearing him will not soon forget.

His benevolent exertions were not confined within denominational limits. In conjunction with the Rev. W. Evans, the Rev. E. Atkyns Bray and John Taylor, Esq., of London, he was one of the founders of the Tavistock Public Library, and was latterly admitted a "free member," in acknowledgment of his various services thereto.

For fifty years he was trustee of Watts' Charity, which is a source of considerable benefit to the town. He rejoiced, indeed, in every indication of improvement in his native place, and spared no labour to promote it both materially and socially.

On the 2nd November, his remains were deposited in the family vault in the Dissenting cemetery; he was followed to the grave by a large multitude of people from all denominations, *all* being desirous of paying this tribute of respect to the memory of one so much and so universally esteemed and loved. The funeral service was conducted by the Rev. D. Griffith, minister of the chapel; and on the following Sunday funeral sermons were delivered by the same gentleman to large and deeply attentive congregations. The morning discourse was founded on Psalm cxxvii. 2, "He giveth His beloved sleep;" and among other true and appropriate words spoken, we may record the following. The preacher having dwelt upon the more prominent of the many excellences which distinguished the character of the deceased, said—"In my comparatively brief intercourse with him, what appeared to me to be a more rare and precious characteristic of his spiritual nature than any other was *his habitual nearness to God.* The Divine Spirit seemed to be interfused through his whole being, and one could not speak to him of divine and holy things without feeling that they were *constantly* present to his thought, so *immediate* was his response, *so living and so true* his sympathy. His heart leaped up, as it were, to meet one's own whenever it beat with high and holy sympathies. His eye glistened with a holy joy when one touched upon the infinite love of God, the unsearchable riches of Christ, and the immortal life of the spirit,—themes so near and so dear to his heart. Of him it may indeed be said with truth, 'His delight was in the law of the Lord, and in His law did he meditate day and night.'"

We shall only further add an extract or two from the letters of friends to whom Mr. Commins had been long and intimately known. The following words of sympathy were addressed to the bereaved widow: "I hasten to offer you my sincere sympathy in your *heavy bereavement*. A man of a purer mind and nobler character I never knew, and I am happy to think that his end was so calm and peaceful. He was always supported in his trials by those cheering views of our Heavenly Father and of the mission of His Son which he had imbibed and cherished in his youth. His was indeed the life of a true Christian; and that I may catch a portion of his spirit, and my last end be like his, will be my constant and earnest prayer." The following words are from another pen: "A purer spirit was never called to its Father's presence. His serene yet genial life has left behind it memories that cannot fail to impart somewhat of heavenly influence to those who cherish them. He was a true disciple of his Master. He had caught the finer, womanly tone and temper of the Saviour's spirit, as I have never perhaps seen it embodied in a man's nature, and it surrounded him with an atmosphere that was spiritual and was spiritualizing. He has left on my own heart and memory an image to be cherished till latest life. Too unworldly—if that be a fault—he passed through life with a child's love and tenderness and trust towards the Heavenly Father; and if his were not the more coveted circumstances of worldly prosperity, it was the much more desirable lot of a godly and contented spirit. He has gone to his reward. May those whom he leaves behind, near and dear to him, be imbued with his spirit, and, cherishing it on earth, be fitted to follow him to the higher blessedness of heaven!"

"Tranquil amidst alarms,
Death found him on the field—
A veteran slumbering on his arms,
Beneath his red-cross shield."

D. G.

Dec. 14, at Southampton, of acute bronchitis, aged 36, SARAH, eldest daughter of Mr. Joseph SEATON, of Chatham. She was deeply impressed with the truth and importance of Unitarian views of the gospel, and it was her anxious desire to promote their wider diffusion. Cut off in the prime of life from further active duty, and from the society of friends by whom she was much esteemed, she submitted with entire resignation to the will of her Heavenly Father, and departed in earnest hope of "glory yet to be revealed."

Dec. 3, at Lewes, after a few days' illness, ROSE FAULCONER, eldest daughter of John Edward FULLAGAR, Esq., solicitor, and granddaughter of Rev. J. Fullagar, of Chichester, aged 25.

When Death's dread blasts such flowers blight,
"We walk by faith and not by sight;"
For Hope, blest Hope, to ease our pain,
Assures us they will bloom again.

J. F.

It is with profound regret that we announce the death of Rev. GEORGE HARRIS, at Newcastle, on the morning of Dec. 24. This sad intelligence of the departure of one of our most energetic and successful labourers both in pastoral and missionary work, will be a painful shock to many Unitarians in England, Scotland and Ireland. Of the particulars of his last illness we have heard nothing. His health gave signs a few months ago of giving way under the pressure of his indefatigable labours. At the request of his flock, he sought the restoration of his health in a quiet retreat for three months on the borders of Scotland. He returned a few weeks ago to his home and, as we supposed, to his public duties, when the melancholy tidings of his decease reached us. The funeral obsequies are appointed for the 29th of December, and Rev. R. Brook Aspland is to be the officiating minister then and on the occasion of the funeral sermon. Our future numbers will doubtless be supplied with full particulars of the public services of this eminent man. The Unitarian church can ill bear at the present time the loss of such an able and outspoken minister. May God put it into the hearts of them that remain to *work*, with redoubled energy and perfect faithfulness, *while it is day!*

MARRIAGES.

Oct. 25, at Great George-Street chapel, Liverpool, by Rev. T. Raffles, D.D., LL.D., SAMUEL FRANCIS, eldest son of Samuel STONE, Esq., of Elmfield, Stoneygate, near Leicester, to MARIA, fourth daughter of Charles GILLHAM, Esq., of Liverpool.

Dec. 14, at Upper Brook-Street chapel, Manchester, by Rev. J. H. Hutton, B.A., the Rev. JAMES HARROP, minister of the Hulme Domestic Mission, to HARRIET, second daughter of Mr. John HILL, machinist, of Manchester.

THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CLXXXII.] FEBRUARY, 1860. [Vol. XVI.

THE ULSTER REVIVAL OF 1859.*

In our former article on the recent Revival in the eastern part of Ulster, we described at sufficient length the origin, the object and the prevailing spirit of the movement. We have now to call attention to some details from which its nature may be correctly apprehended. We shall condense what we have to state into as narrow bounds as possible: but it is not easy to be very brief when a great many facts are to be enumerated, and when no general description will apply exactly to all cases and localities; for the movement varied at different times and places, according to the character and gifts of those who took a leading part in urging it forward.

The principal part of the "revival" was effected through the instrumentality of special meetings held for the purpose, and it may therefore be useful to give some account of the manner in which they were conducted. And this we shall endeavour to do as correctly as we can, referring generally to the authorities on which we rely, and begging our readers to bear in mind that the details were not always exactly the same, though in all there were of necessity points of resemblance.

In general it may be stated that few cases of what is called "conviction" occurred at the ordinary congregational services of the Lord's-day. We have heard of a few instances in which "conviction" was experienced during the celebration of public worship at the usual time and place; but in comparison with the entire number of persons affected, these were but as "the small dust in the balance." The principal instrumentality in diffusing the revival spirit and producing "cases" was that of prayer-meetings and fellowship-meetings specially devoted to the revival work; to which those who frequented them resorted with their heads full of the revival; and, not a few, with an earnest desire and wish that it might spread, and especially that they might be themselves then and there "revived."

The revival meetings were sometimes held in the open air; but these, though they were attended by immense numbers of persons, occasionally amounting to five thousand, (in no case, by calculation, exceeding ten thousand,) and therefore well calculated to extend and increase the excitement of the public mind,

* Continued from p. 31.

—were not by any means so productive of "cases" as those which were held in chapels, school-rooms and private houses. In these also it was remarked that if the meeting was thinly attended, few or no "cases" occurred; if the place was well filled, a certain number of "convictions" might be expected; if the crowd was great, if the atmosphere was suffocating, if the meeting was held at night, and if the proceedings were long protracted, a great number of cases might be counted upon with certainty. At some crowded, late and long-protracted meetings, nearly one-half of the persons present appear to have been "struck." But such successes were by no means common. If the numbers of those who had been previously revived were deducted, we are convinced that the "cases" would, at most meetings, have presented a much smaller average.

The manner of conducting these meetings was usually as follows:—The minister or ministers, for frequently several were present, after engaging in singing and prayer, delivered a sermon, address or discourse, intended to awaken the hearers to a lively concern for the state of their souls. The writer of this paper was present during the delivery of one such address; it was plain, scriptural and practical, delivered with considerable power of language and earnestness of manner. But no apparent results followed. It was such an address as might be heard any Sunday morning in a hundred Unitarian congregations, except that it was spoken, not read; and it was listened to, as such an address would have been listened to in any of our chapels, with respectful attention; but though it is to be hoped good impressions were made on the hearts of some among the auditory, and any impression produced by such an address must have been good, still there was no more outward manifestation of a change wrought upon their spirits than would be witnessed in Essex Street or Portland Place. As bearing on the revival, it was a *coup manqué*. But this was by no means a common case as regards either the discourse or its effects. Archdeacon Stopford thus describes a discourse at which he was present: "The preacher's natural qualifications appeared to be but small. His manner was cold, dry, unimpassioned. His voice was naturally good, and, like his action, appeared to have been carefully studied; his tones were unnatural, as if the peculiar cry of hysteria had been taken for a model. He did not appear to be possessed of either intellectual or sympathetic power." In the discourse "there was nothing of the love of Christ, nor of the guilt of sin; there was *nothing to awaken conscience;* hell, *h—e—ll,* H——E——LL, was the one cry; and the sole object aimed at was to produce a sensation of intensified torture, of physical self-feeling. Remarkable as this sermon was for the paucity and smallness of ideas, it could not be wholly without ideas; *but passages were.* . . . . The skill shewn in the wording" [of these passages] "was great, and the

whole object of the study appeared to be the elimination of every idea or thought. It was evidently here that the chief labour of preparation had been bestowed; and it was precisely here, where every idea had disappeared, that the preacher bestowed the whole force of voice, tone and gesture,—a fact which I had observed in other sermons before.... Precisely as I expected, when all sense and meaning were gone, the preacher had his base and unmanly triumph in evoking a wild and long-continued scream of hysteric agony, which, as it rose more loud and thrilled more wild, did effectually silence the preacher, and left him standing in his pulpit with a most self-satisfied air, until the removal of the stricken female enabled him to proceed." (*Stopford*, pp. 39—42.) By far the greater number of revival preachers appear to have conducted their services on the same principle, and with similar result.

To this result the prayers, both those offered in private by the worshipers before they came to the place of meeting, and those to which they listened when there, contributed not a little. "It is notorious," says Mr. Stopford, "that *hundreds of mill-girls in Belfast have prayed and are praying to be 'struck.'* This was acknowledged to me by an elder or office-bearer in a place of worship famous for such conversions. It was also told to me by many of the mill-girls themselves. I need hardly say that such a prayer answers itself. *I say that they learn in places of worship to offer such prayers.* I was present, in a Presbyterian meeting-house, at a prayer, offered with the most frenzied excitement and gesticulations, '*that God would then and there descend and strike all the unconverted to the earth!*' That prayer was accompanied throughout by a storm of cries and groans and exclamations and *Amens*, all having the true hysteric sound. This was the most frightful scene I have witnessed in my life. At the moment of the awful COMMAND to the Almighty to come down and strike, it was perfectly terrific. No such scene would be permitted in any Bedlam upon earth. Presence at such a prayer could be redeemed from guilt only by the purpose of warning. I have many terrible recollections of life, but this prayer is the most frightful of them all. I have been used to be calm in the presence of hysteria; I was calm then; but the physical effect upon myself was as if I had been drinking plain brandy." (*Stopford*, p. 38.) It is evident that nothing can be easier than for any district-society or ragged-school committee that wishes, to get up a revival scene on this principle. Let them but gain access to a number of hard-worked, ill-fed and very unenlightened young people, especially females, and let them set a suitable minister to preach and pray in the style above described,—*any one could do so if he were wicked enough*,—and they will have a plentiful crop of "cases," as sure as like causes produce like effects.

Is it wonderful that among a crowded assemblage of persons, drawn together in the desire of experiencing and the hope of witnessing the soul-reviving change which that hysteric scream of agony was universally believed to signify, some young and impressible female, attending on such an exciting service after a day of heavy toil in a mill or factory, having perhaps tasted no other food throughout the day, and almost to a certainty having had no other refreshment after her day's work, than a little bread and tea, (for such is the habit of most of the female workers in factories in the north of Ireland,) should yield to the emotions of alarm and fear which it was the aim of her spiritual guide to awaken? Is it wonderful that she should experience a dread and horror of that eternal torment which she was taught to believe would be her inevitable doom unless she should be rescued, "like a brand from the burning," by the immediate agency of God's Holy Spirit? Is it wonderful that these feelings should manifest themselves by the usual signs of deep emotion, by nervous agitation, paleness, sighs and tears, tremours, shrieks, convulsive movements? Is it wonderful that when one was thus violently agitated, others, her companions, equally predisposed, should catch the moral infection, with symptoms perhaps aggravated? and that nearly all present should be impressed in a manner to prepare them, unless they happened to be persons gifted with peculiar strength of nerve, for yielding to the sympathetic influence, if not on *that*, at least on some approaching occasion?

We see nothing in this that is not easily accounted for by the operation of the known laws of mind and body. To us the fact would seem marvellous if such phenomena did not manifest themselves frequently under such circumstances. There is nothing in these occurrences that any preacher of ordinary powers could not reproduce, if he were cruel enough to desire it, provided only that he could draw together a suitable auditory, and would stoop to use the needful appliances. Of this we have a singular example in the narrative of his own experience given by an American minister,—who, strange to say, appears quite unconscious of the infamous nature of the behaviour which he relates. After speaking of a particular convulsive movement with which several persons were affected during the progress of a religious revival, he says, that "during its prevalence *we made several experiments;* being inexperienced in the ministry, we knew not what to do with it. While preaching, we have, after a smooth and gentle course of expression, *suddenly changed our voice and language, expressing something awful and alarming;* and, *instantly*, some dozen or twenty persons, or more, would be jerked forward where they were sitting, and with a suppressed noise, once or twice, somewhat like the barking of a dog. And so *it would continue or abate* according to the tenor or strain of my discourse." (*Bodily Effects*, &c., p. 13.)

But the most terrific preaching would, we imagine, have frequently failed of its designed effect, at least during the revival of last summer, if it had not been aided by various auxiliary circumstances. Of these, the most efficacious was a crowd. Little could be accomplished in a spacious, well-lighted and well-ventilated building, and not over-thronged; especially during the day-time; but if a multitude could be got together in a place ill fitted for their accommodation, on a hot summer's evening after night-fall, all the doors and windows kept close shut, with few lights, and a succession of fear-inspiring preachers addressing the audience by turns,—with singing, prayers and the narrations of their experience by the converts,—for three, four or five hours without interruption, a plentiful harvest of cases might be confidently looked for. These helps were freely resorted to. One writer, who sees in the Revival movement "much that he would hope is the gracious work of the Holy Spirit," says, "We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that, in some places at least, stimulants of a questionable and unwholesome kind have been made use of. It cannot be denied that, in some instances, the great attraction was a morbid desire of seeing physical manifestations, *the smiting down of converts.* Wherever this was anticipated, the multitudes flocked together. The more quiet ministrations of the regular minister gave place to the services of some great preacher, or some one fresh from the scene of revivals. On such occasions, other meeting-houses in the neighbourhood were closed, and large multitudes thronged to some one place altogether insufficient for so dense a crowd. The services were continued amid a suffocating atmosphere till almost midnight hours. I have passed young and old flocking into the meetings in the country at *six in the evening*, and have been met by anxious parents *at near twelve* the same night, asking me, 'Had I seen any signs of their young people returning, and whether I had heard of any being affected?' I learned subsequently that on that occasion some were so affected. It was no wonder. That night was intensely hot and sultry, and the meeting full to overflowing. I stop not here to speak of the impropriety of allowing or encouraging young people to be from under their parents' roof at such hours of the night. And *twelve o'clock is early* compared with what we have read of elsewhere." (*King*, pp. 18—20.) A revival minister gives the following account of one night's operations as a sample of the rest: "The difficulty used to be to get the people into the church, but the difficulty now is to get them out of it. *One night and morning* we had three services. The first of these lasted three hours and a half. I pronounced the benediction, intending to dismiss the people; but no; they kept possession; only a very few left. After some half-hour, we engaged in prayer and praise again. I pronounced the benediction, intending to dismiss the people; but no; only a few left. Having attended

for some time *to a number of weak and anxious persons*, presuming that a third attempt might be successful, *we engaged in prayer for a poor girl, who seemed to us to be dreadfully tormented*—(and oh! the deep and universal fervour of that prayer—all prayed—very many wept)—and having sung to a plaintive air a portion of a prayer-psalm, for the last time that morning I pronounced the benediction, and left *between one and two o'clock.* Many remained." (*Moore*, pp. 19, 20.) Verily, it is not surprising that the writer had "a number of weak and anxious persons" to attend to on that memorable night; the wonder is that there was only one "poor girl" among the hundreds present who seemed to be "dreadfully tormented." The immediate result of this excitement is thus indicated: "Persons from England and Scotland and many parts of Ireland were to be seen perambulating the streets and lanes of Ballymena," (and it might have been added, of Belfast and several other towns,) ... "anxious to witness with their own eyes and ears this strange thing of which they had heard in their distant homes, *a half-dead soul revived by God's spirit! a poor lost sinner with God's 'arrows sticking fast in him;' his crimes over him like a thick cloud; his iniquities 'a burden too heavy for him to bear;' his heart pained within him, 'the terrors of death having fallen upon him;' fearfulness and trembling and horror overwhelming him; now crying, again shouting, screaming for mercy; again unintelligible to auditors; a modern Hezekiah, 'chattering like a crane or a swallow.'*" (*Moore*, p. 6.) That some were silently impressed, that some who had been careless about religion and its duties, did, during the continuance of this epidemic, begin to pay more attention than they had formerly done to divine things, and that without passing through this "*crying, shouting, screaming*" process, we doubt not. Of the permanent good effects of a change so manifested, we are far more hopeful than we can be of the results of any fanatical terrors or enthusiastic ecstasies. But these cases were comparatively few. They were little regarded either by the revival preachers or by the multitude of the revived. It was not usually to such persons that "the strangers who flocked from England, Scotland and many parts of Ireland" were conducted when it was desired to bring before them specimens of the great work. Their cases were not trumpeted in newspapers, nor were their histories detailed in platform harangues, nor were they themselves paraded in crowded assemblies, nor were they called upon to address to their fellow-mortals the exhortation, "Go and do thou likewise." No; these honours and distinctions were reserved for the "stricken," on whom the Holy Spirit was supposed to have set his seal by subjecting them to some bodily disease more or less violent. And it was by the number of such that the success of the movement, and the usefulness of measures intended to hasten and extend it, were both popularly and pro-

fessionally estimated. Of the light in which these physical manifestations were regarded, we might bring forward many proofs; we content ourselves with two. The first is from the *Banner of Ulster*, (a revivalist organ,) of Tuesday, July 5. "A feeling of devout attention pervaded the meeting, and *although* there were no decided physical symptoms of awakening, *yet* much good was apparently done." And the Lord Bishop of Down, who has lent his sanction and countenance to the movement, in an address delivered at a conference held to promote the work, found it necessary "to caution his audience against the *prevalent* but erroneous opinion that there had been no important influence of the Spirit, no real conversion to God, except in the cases of conviction which had been accompanied by an external influence upon the body." (*Salmon*, p. 36.) With such notions in their heads, intellectually and physically predisposed to yield to the strong excitement of the hour, subjected at the place of meeting to physical and intellectual conditions the best calculated to increase that tendency, terrified by the awful denunciations of the preachers, stimulated by the example of many, and warmed by the sympathy of all present, it was difficult even for robust men and strong-minded women to resist the impulse. We have been assured by several whose strength of mind we know, that when they heard the sobs and screams, and saw the looks of agony, and beheld the convulsive writhings of persons around them, sometimes in the same pew, or who had been seated on the same bench till they fell from it powerless, shrieking for mercy, it required all their fortitude and self-command to enable them to refrain from doing as others did. They would have felt it as a relief, if they had not known it to be a sin, to fall down and scream and "wallow foaming," as so many, sometimes a dozen at a time, were doing. We repeat, the wonder is not that so many hard-wrought, ill-fed, ignorant and impressionable young persons were affected in this violent manner, but that so many escaped the contagion.

We next consider the treatment to which the "stricken" or "convicted" were subjected. It is manifest that these affections of the frame, though produced in a great degree by mental excitement, constituted a morbid condition of the body, and required medical treatment, or at least the employment of the hygienic remedies applicable in such cases; among which, fresh air, copious affusion of cold water, followed up by perfect quiet for a time, soothing treatment during the whole stage of convalescence, and the absence, if possible for ever, of that excitement which had led to results so deplorable, are the most important and the most obvious. In a few instances, owing to the presence and the commanding influence of men of sense and science, these remedies were applied, and always with perfect success. But seldom indeed were such humane and rational means resorted to.

By the greater number of the revivalists it would have been looked upon as a stifling of the work of God to employ them. Archdeacon Stopford had made bodily affections of this class an especial study, and had attained to great eminence in the treatment of them. He came to Belfast, desiring to afford the aid of his knowledge and experience to those who were thus suffering. "I heard," he writes, "no cry in Belfast *which I could not easily have subdued.* I thought, on going there, that I might have been useful in this way; but I was told by those of the clergy to whom I offered my services, that *I would not be admitted into any house in Belfast* for such a purpose; '*that* would be a quenching of the Spirit.' I found that this was true; and in public assemblies *where the object was to produce those cries,* the attempt was more hopeless still." *(Stopford,* p. 73.) "Many of these cases absolutely require medical treatment, *now sedulously excluded.*" (P. 77.) "There is unfortunately a universal desire in Belfast" (and not in Belfast only, the venerable writer might have said, but in all districts to which the revival has extended) "*to exclude the physician from such cases,* a desire perhaps too readily acquiesced in." (P. 78.) In the absence of the physician, the actual treatment was in almost every instance and every point exactly the reverse of that which medical science would have prescribed. "The Rev. Edward Metcalf describes several of the cases which he saw as originally nothing more than cases of fainting under excitement, but which were worked into hysterics by keeping them *for two or three hours, as is the case frequently,* without any of the ordinary remedies which are used in such cases being applied; but instead thereof a very boisterous scene of excitement is carried on around them, in exceedingly loud hymn-singing and praying at the pitch of the voice." In one example which he gives, "a girl of about twenty years of age was leading some persons in most boisterous hymn-singing round another girl who had fainted at a meeting which had just closed, and who was evidently suffering under a hysterical affection; but this young person resisted even the authority of the doctor, who wished to have the girl removed to near the air and her dress loosened a little, saying that she had been 'a case' herself and understood it much better, and nothing was so good as hymn-singing." *(Salmon,* p. 35.) Mr. Stopford adds some particulars which introduce a new phase of the movement. He visited "a meeting-house famous for 'cases,' but which is supposed to be conducted, and is conducted, with more decency than some others. The preacher, before giving out his text, requested that if any 'cases' occurred, the congregation would be quiet, and leave it to the office-bearers of the church, who had made full preparation for their reception. While the preacher was urging, with the peculiar pointing of the hand" (at particular persons) "above described, '*Your case is as bad as hell can make it,*' (!) a poor

girl cried out and fell. In reproving the excitement which followed, the preacher said, '*God is doing his work in that individual.*' When the sermon closed, I obtained admission to the room to which this girl had been carried. It was small, and very narrow and stifling. No air, no water, was there. A more pitiable sight I never saw. This girl was about fifteen years of age, or perhaps a year or two older; her frame was weak and thin; her small hands stained and ground with hard work; her skin delicate and transparent; her hair and eyelashes long and dark; her neck marked with scrofula; with a highly intellectual face, seldom seen in her rank of life, and now made painfully interesting by the unearthly expression of cataleptic hysteria; every movement of her head and limbs, every expression of the countenance, every moan, markedly hysterical. She had previously been struggling and screaming, but was now quiet; her lips sometimes moving, but inaudibly. She had spoken of the devil catching souls to throw them into hell, crying, 'Away! you shan't have mine!' just the last impression made upon her failing mind. I learned that this was the third attack this poor girl had had in a short time, each succeeding one being more severe than the former. . . . . She was seated on a form, reclining *in the arms of a coarse young man about twenty years of age.* He was no relation of hers, being ignorant of her name or residence. *He seemed employed for the purpose*, and related, with apparent glee, that before we came in it had taken all his strength to hold her in her struggles. In this small room, and gathered closely round her, were eight or ten young women, some of whom (perhaps all) had recently been hysterical, and two or three young men, (not related to her,) of whom one at least had been lately hysterical too. *No elderly woman was there*, nor any elderly man, except one who came in once or twice during the hour we remained there. . . . . These proceedings *are fast wearing out all feelings of religious veneration, and of respect and decency towards the female sex.*" (*Stopford*, pp. 47—50.) The venerable writer never uttered a truer word. The meeting-house in which he witnessed this indecent scene was one of the most orderly and decorous of the revival conventicles. In others, girls of various ages, from seventeen to four-and-twenty, were to be seen lying on the floor, kicking in strong hysterics, with a ring of young persons, *chiefly young men*, singing, praying, shouting over them, for hours at a time, without the presence of any aged person of either sex,—encouraged to manifest their Christian affection for each other, as soon as "peace" was attained, by embracing and kissing each other,—the females often carried home, when the meeting was over, on the shoulders of the young men, the former still struggling and screaming, the latter singing hymns, and, when there was no necessity for lending physical support, permitted to accompany each other to their sometimes distant habitations at any

hour of the night or morning, sometimes at twelve o'clock, more frequently at half-past one or two. We violate no confidence nor reveal what is now any secret, when we state that the consequences have been in many cases such as might have been expected. Some of the young women whose conversion was last summer hailed with the most exulting triumph, and who were brought forward at public meetings to detail to others the experiences through which they had passed, are no longer in a fit state to appear upon platforms. This is a sad, but by no means the saddest, phase of the Revival movement.

It will have been seen from some of the extracts quoted in the foregoing paragraphs, that the fits of hysteria, which were looked upon as the certain symptoms of the work of divine grace, recurred more than once in certain cases. Indeed, there were but few examples of their occurring only once, and in almost all such cases the sufferers had been kept carefully out of the way of the renewal of that excitement by which the disease had originally been brought on. In some instances, even this was no protection. The recurrence of the deeply impressed idea, at home or during the hours of labour, was in some constitutions enough to occasion a return of all the violent symptoms, and these not seldom with increased violence. The exhibition of those symptoms generally sufficed to propagate the malady to others who witnessed them, by the force of sympathy, and the tendency which most persons feel,—though some are able to restrain it,—to imitate involuntary actions which they witness; such as yawning, smiling, sighing, shedding tears, &c. Hence during the revival almost all the schools in entire districts had to be suspended; all, or nearly all, the children, and in some cases the teachers also, being disabled by hysterical seizures from performing their respective tasks. Not a few factories and spinning-mills were obliged to stop work, all the younger hands having caught the infection. In the neighbourhood of Ballymena, usually a busy manufacturing district, the persons who resorted to the market for commercial purposes were for several weeks obliged to return home without doing any business at all,—workers, salesmen, clerks, being all either "revived" themselves, or busy in extending the revival. Mr. Moore, one of the ministers of the place, says,—"On my return after a two days' absence, I found the town in a state of great excitement. *Many families had not gone to bed for two or three previous nights!* From dozens of houses, *night and day*, you would hear, when passing along, loud cries of mercy by convicts, or the voice of prayer by kind visitors, or the sweet tones of sacred song. Business seemed at a stand-still. In some streets, four or five crowds of people . . . engaged in prayer or praise, all at the same time. A large number of people had been metamorphosed into prophets and precentors. A goodly number of young men in business esta-

blishments in town, and not a few young workmen, gave up their entire time, day and night," &c. &c. (*Moore*, p. 5.) In manufacturing establishments, it was quite a common experience that if one or two, who had perhaps attended at a revival meeting till a late hour the preceding night, uttered a shriek and fell down in hysterics during the hours of labour, ten or a dozen cases would occur on that or the succeeding day, and more every day afterwards, till in a short time the whole of the workers were rendered unfit for their work. And it deserves notice, that among these were often found young persons who had been subjected to no religious excitement; who neither had nor pretended to have any deep anxiety about their religious condition; whose malady was totally unaccompanied with any religious impressions or ideas whatever, until these were put into their heads, or into their mouths, by the zeal of others, who, hearing of their being "struck," flocked around them, to sing and pray and glorify God. Such marked attentions bestowed on the "cases" stimulated a return of the symptoms in them, and tended to spread the malady still more widely. Explain it as we may, there was seen in many of the patients a relinquishment of the power of self-control, a submission to the exciting influence, at first voluntary in part and in part unconscious, but ending in a mental and bodily state in which the sufferer was utterly powerless to resist the spasmodic tendencies. It was remarked also that the stricken were, in their hours of recovered consciousness, greatly pleased by the sympathy that was shewn for them and the notice which they attracted, and that they seldom failed to shape their conduct and conversation so as to increase the interest felt in them by pious visitors;—a tendency which has been observed in other cases of hysteria.

It was natural for patients recovering from such a violent paroxysm to experience a delightful sensation of relief, and to express it in their countenance, tone and manner. There are few higher pleasures connected with the body more full of enjoyment than the return to a healthy condition after an attack of sore disease. This delightful feeling was, by the stricken themselves and by all the agents in the revival work without any exception, regarded as the certain sign that their sins were pardoned, that their souls were washed in the blood of Jesus, that the Holy Spirit had wrought a converting change upon their hearts, and that their everlasting salvation was secure. In short, they had "found peace." They were convinced, converted and renewed, and nothing more remained to be done for their spiritual condition by God or man. This conviction still more highly exalted their delight, their gratitude, their joy. It became now almost a necessity of their nature to manifest their ardent affection for their brothers and sisters who had passed through the same experiences. "The converts," says Mr. Moore,

"feel and manifest an intense love for each other. In fact, they cannot be happy out of each other's society. Hence for the first week or two they were to be found gathered into particular houses, night and day, in companies, singing and praying; and at public meetings they will, if possible, be together. They do not care very much for any one who has not their towering love and zeal; but any person whom they consider to be one of themselves, a 'brother' or a 'sister,' as they say, they will receive with open arms..... I have seen ..... companions embracing their old associates in sin, now in Christ, with the deepest intensity of holy love. It was indeed greeting with an holy and a hearty kiss." *(Moore,* p. 15.) Close akin to this feeling was "a deep anxiety, a tender compassion for the unconverted, the perishing," which Mr. Moore compares to the compassion of Christ for doomed Jerusalem. "These youthful Christians, in the warm overflowing of their first love, tearfully plead with and for sinners to come to Christ; and when some poor, lost, blinded one has his eyes opened by the Spirit to see himself—that horrible sight—a guilty, polluted soul; and when in consternation he cries for mercy, joy pervades their countenances as they look at each other," &c. &c. But they did not always select a proper occasion for the exercise of their zeal. "More than once have I been necessitated to cause young persons to be carried out of public meetings, to prevent utter confusion. From silent prayer on their knees, they would rise, and standing on the seats, the tears profusely flowing from their eyes, with all the anxiety of a life-and-death struggle, they would call upon sinners to come to Jesus, and upon God's Holy Spirit to bring them to Jesus. This compassion for sinners, or [desire?] for the glory of Christ in their salvation, cannot be controlled." *(Moore,* p. 16.) All agree that some of the stricken ones, at a certain stage of the malady or recovery from it, manifest a refinement and grace of feature, voice, motion and utterance, which they never possessed before, and often a wonderful readiness and propriety in the words in which they clothe their sentiments. This has been noticed by all observers,—by Mr. Stopford and Mr. Metcalfe, as well as by Mr. Moore, Mr. Adams and Mr. Seaver,—the only difference being that the former gentlemen state this to be one of the familiar and recognized symptoms of hysteria; the others regard it as an indubitable evidence of the power and presence of the Divine Spirit. In many of the converts there is a remarkable fluency in prayer, and a gift of speech in addressing others that amounts to real eloquence. The writer of this paper never witnessed a more winning display of Christian feeling and feminine sweetness than was shewn in a short address delivered, manifestly without premeditation, by a young female, who seemed to be in the rank of a factory girl, at a revival meeting. The only part of her discourse which it was impossible to

believe was that in which she spoke of her own bad heart and sinful state, until she was "smitten down," and then "found peace." No one who saw and heard her could think that her heart was bad.

The tendency of the state of mind into which very many of the converts were wrought or had worked themselves is to generate visions. Accordingly numbers of them were favoured with glimpses, and more than glimpses, of the celestial and the infernal regions. As might be expected, the Saviour is personally and frequently made visible to these, his especial favourites, in their trances. Mr. Moore declares that their views of him are "in some cases quite as glorious as that enjoyed by the apostle John in the Revelations, i. 13—16; and when thus brought by the Spirit 'into the chambers of the King,' and while 'his eyes chain them in the galleries,' there is in them, as in the apostle, almost no strength. A smile of celestial loveliness plays over the countenance, though perhaps naturally plain, and pervades it with a sweetness, a charm, far transcending the loveliest smile of the loveliest countenance on earth in ordinary circumstances. The hands are often raised upward, as if beckoning the Beloved to come, and then they are clasped energetically over the bosom, as if embracing him to the very heart. The feeling at the moment, whether uttered or unexpressed, is, 'O my sweet Jesus!' 'My Beloved is mine and I am his!' 'Tell me, ye daughters of Jerusalem, is there any Beloved like unto my Beloved?' .... These enjoyments are occasionally interrupted, apparently by some hostile agency. Then the countenance wears an angry aspect; the hands are energetically moved, as if to thrust the intruder away; and these or such words are uttered, '*No—I won't—I won't go with you;—away, away!*' In some cases, the conflict with the enemy is fearful, agonizing to both mind and body." (*Moore*, pp. 12, 13.) This writer does not mention, what however is perfectly notorious, that several of the converts profess themselves to be able, on awakening from their trance, to describe the scenes through which they have passed, or which they have witnessed in the spiritual world. In every such case, *the narrator is herself*,—for the visions are almost exclusively confined to females,—*the heroine of her tale.* "Visions and delusions of the sight or mind," says Archdeacon Stopford, "are one of the most ordinary phenomena of hysteria. Almost every girl now 'struck' in Belfast has 'visions,' and would be greatly disappointed if she had not: she would think it only half done, and would probably pray to be struck again. When the hysterical affection is mistaken for the operation of the Holy Spirit, these visions are naturally mistaken for revelations from God.... During my visit to Belfast, I sat by the bedside of a young woman,—'struck' for the third time,—recently cataleptic,—and, when I saw her, in a state of ecstacy. She was at first in prayer, with a remarkable power of utterance; then in thanksgiving for

spiritual operations in herself; then in ardent desire of visions and revelations; then describing aloud the vision as she saw it.... 'Oh! now it opens, and I see Him now, and He is beautiful; and, look! the angels open out, and He comes forward, and He comes to me; and what has He in His hand? Oh! it is a gown! and how beautiful it is! What a beautiful gown! And it is a gown of glory. And it is for me. And, look! He comes straight to me! And what is he going to do now? He is going to put it on me Himself! And now he puts it on!.... Where am I now? What a beautiful seat! No, no, it's not a seat. *I am sitting on the throne of God*, and Jesus is sitting beside me!' .... I visited her three days afterwards. She was recovering, but still very weak. She had a succession of visitors; for she was considered as one of the most wonderful cases. I expressed a hope that it was not too much for her. She replied, 'I am glad to see so many coming to me; *for I am not so wrapped up in my own glory, but that I think it good for others to pray for me too.*' I had heard that in every case the burden of sin is felt and bemoaned; she said nothing of this; so I put every question that could draw it out, and at last asked her plainly of it; it was quite evident, and acknowledged by herself, that she had felt nothing of this. I inquired about her future attendance upon public worship; she replied that *when she got proper clothes she would go, but not till then.* I told her of the warning in scripture against forsaking the assembling of ourselves together. I asked, would she have kept from Christ, when on earth, on account of her clothes? She replied that 'it was easy before Him, but it was hard to do it before man.' I pointed out to her the trial that she now was brought to, between conformity to the will of Christ and being governed by the fear of man. She said tartly that '*she knew all that, but that she never would go to a house of worship till she had proper clothes to go in.*' Her countenance was now dark and angry, and she shewed very clearly that she wished to have no further conversation with me. I left her with a sad feeling that her heart was unchanged and untouched; yet I have met with no case so much made of by ministers and ladies. I fear that great harm is done to persons so deluded. What can be more deplorable than that a soul, in this state of darkness, should be deluded with the belief in false revelations assuring her own salvation, *without one sign or evidence of true repentance?* Had not her own delusive visions set aside from her the teaching of the word of God?" *(Stopford*, pp. 50—54.) The Archdeacon gives an instance in which he heard the asserted visions of a similar enthusiast *quoted and commented on in a pulpit in Belfast as direct revelations from God!* (Pp. 54—57.)

We had intended to cite some farther examples, but we have trespassed long on our readers' patience. The moral results of the movement yet remain to be considered.

CRELLIUS "DE UNO DEO PATRE," WATERLAND AND BENTLEY.

In the library formerly at Totteridge Park, Hertfordshire, which now forms part of the much more extensive library at Hartwell, near Aylesbury, is a copy of the English translation of the treatise of John Crellius, "touching One God the Father," with the enigmatical date at the bottom of the title, "Printed at *Cosmoburg*, at the sign of the *Sun-beams*, in the year of our Lord, 1665." The words *Cosmoburg* and *Sun-beams* are in red ink and in italics. A writer in the Monthly Repository (III. 14) says, respecting "this pleasantry at the bottom of the title-page," that "it shews the caution with which a work deemed heretical was sent forth, when the publisher could only venture to describe himself as a citizen of the world." A correspondent in the same volume (III. 142), in reference to another insertion at the bottom of the title-page of similar works, viz., "London: printed for *Richard Moore* at the *Seven Stars* in St. Paul's Churchyard," conjectures that it "affords another instance of the necessity that the friends of free inquiry of those times were under of resorting to a variety of expedients to preserve themselves from the animadversions of their illiberal and persecuting neighbours." Mr. Wallace, on the contrary (*Antitrinitarian Biography*, I. 155, 156, III. 185, 204, 205), considers Richard Moore as a real name, and it appears to me that he is in the right. During the Commonwealth, a bookseller, who favoured Socinianism, might venture to publish his own name. On the restoration of Charles II. this became unsafe, in consequence of which the same Richard Moore, or his successors, professed to edit similar publications at *Cosmoburg, the city of the world.*

The same translation appeared again with the following impress at the bottom of the title: "London: Printed, 1691." The fact appears to have been that the new title was then printed, but nothing more. On comparing the two editions, if they may be so called, of 1665 and 1691, I find a perfect agreement in all particulars, including wire-marks, printer's signs, paging, and errors of the press.

The above-mentioned copy of the original edition (1665) has been kindly lent to me by its present owner, Dr. John Lee, of Hartwell, for the purpose of noticing an entry which occurs on the fly-leaf before the title. This entry is in the handwriting of Dr. Lee's great-grandfather, the Right Hon. Sir William Lee, Chief Justice of the Court of King's Bench. After relating the high repute of Crellius among the Polish Socinians, Sir William records the following fact:

"N.B. Dr. Bentley in my hearing at Trinity College declared he had advised Dr. Waterland to answer *Crellius de Deo*, and seemed to intimate that he could not doe it."

Sir William Lee appears to have been much addicted to the

perusal of scientific and philosophical works. Although brought up as a member of the Church of England, it may be concluded from the notes inserted in his books, that, as he advanced in years and his knowledge of the world expanded, he became very tolerant and was favourable to Unitarianism, although he may never have made any public declaration to that effect. It is probable that, when Sir William Lee heard the preceding declaration, he was on circuit and was Dr. Bentley's guest, since Trinity Lodge, which was Dr. Bentley's abode, has usually had the honour of receiving the judges of assize.

I may add that in the Hartwell library there is a second copy of the original edition of this English translation of Crellius, and that others are in Williams's library, and in the library of Manchester New College; and having been thus led to bring in the name of Bentley as Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, I will refer to another anecdote in the life of that eminent scholar.

Bishop Monk (*Life of Bentley*, p. 644) gives the following account of the condemnation of Ducket, the atheist, who was tried in 1739 before the Vice-Chancellor's court:

"Upon the next court-day only eight heads of Colleges appeared in the schools; whereas a majority of the whole number was indispensably required to sanction the judgment which the Vice-Chancellor was then ready to pronounce. Dr. Bentley's liability to catch cold did not suffer him to leave his house; accordingly, in compliment to the Father of the University and the early refuter of atheistical tenets, the court was adjourned to Trinity Lodge. Here some persons, who generally condemned his words and actions, were scandalized at instances of levity, as ill suiting the solemnity of the occasion. Tradition in the University still records a jest then uttered by Bentley: he inquired of those about him, "which was the atheist?" and on Ducket being pointed out, who was a small and spare personage, he exclaimed, 'What! is that the atheist? I expected to have seen a man as big as Borough, the beadle,' a man of very portly appearance."

I remember hearing Dr. Parr tell the story as follows:

Bentley, having entered the room and having been informed which was the atheist, exclaimed with much energy, "When Jupiter was assailed of old, it was by mighty giants, Ægæon, Briareus and Enceladus. Shall then the throne of the true God be shaken by such a puny wretch as this?"

This version of the story seems to be more in character with Bentley, and to rest on equally good authority.

JAMES YATES.

Lauderdale House, Highgate, Dec. 17, 1859.

THE NATIONAL REVIEWER'S THEORY OF CHRIST'S RESURRECTION.

SIR,

THE letter of the *National Reviewer* in your last number, though it refers chiefly to another of your correspondents, shews me that I too had failed (whether through the reviewer's want of clearness or my want of intelligence) to apprehend his theory on this subject, as being distinct from that of Ewald. I erroneously supposed the reviewer to imply in his remarks that Ewald's views were essentially his own also. I therefore lose no time in rectifying my mistake and adding such remarks as his allusions to my letter seem to call for, treating him still, of course, *impersonally* as the anonymous *National Reviewer*, for the mixed orthodoxy and anti-supernaturalism of whose article I still, as earnestly as at first, desire that the Unitarian denomination should not, through the known genealogy of the *National Review*, be held responsible.

The reviewer, after saying that he agrees with Ewald's remarks on "the mysterious and fitful character" of Christ's appearances to his disciples after his resurrection, thus states the difference between their theories of explanation:

"In *accounting* for the impressions so strongly made on the minds of the disciples which led them to believe in the restoration of their Master to life, I differ from him. So far as I can make out his views, which he has shrouded in more than his ordinary obscurity, he considers the whole affair to have been what the Germans would call a *subjective process*, an intensifying into peculiar vividness of ideas and remembrances already in the mind, without being occasioned by any *extra-personal* influence. For myself, I do not think this an adequate explanation of the phenomena. I cannot account for the recorded change in the language and conduct of the disciples, without the supposition of some presence visiting them, which they recognized in some way inexplicable by us, as that of a real person from the invisible world,—an impression, therefore, which had a cause outside themselves, and was not a mere product of the working of excited minds. I call this a *spiritual* fact, from the want of any more appropriate term to express a reality made cognizable and certain to a human soul through some other avenue than the outward senses. The difference between my own view and Ewald's is, I should think, obvious enough. There seems to me satisfactory evidence that Christ's resurrection or ascension (ἀνάστασις or ἀνάληψις), whichever term we prefer to adopt (for I regard them as only different forms of expression for one and the same mysterious and unsearchable fact, his passage from the present into the next life), was so witnessed to the minds of believers (not through the violation of any natural law, but in virtue of some deeper law affecting the relations of the seen and the unseen worlds, than we are yet able to trace), that they were convinced of the perpetuity of his existence and of the reality of his occasional intercourse with them. My belief, therefore, in the *reality* of a resurrection historically attested is just as strong as theirs who take all

the accounts of the bodily re-appearance in the strictest and most literal sense. Whereas I cannot find that Ewald, though doubtless having a firm general faith in immortality, believes in any direct and extraordinary witness to a resurrection at all."—Pp. 36, 37.

I confess I had understood the reviewer himself to imply that the whole might be considered as having been a *subjective process;* and I thought this (as I now find he does) an inadequate explanation. It was under this impression that I referred to the replies already made to Woolston. "Subjective persuasion" I take to be the philosophical solvent of fact into fancy or history into myth. The historical facts of the gospel (including the resurrection of Christ prominently) I regard as essential to Christian faith, and their historical evidence as an essential of thorough Christian conviction. Hence my earnestness for the reality of Christ's resurrection, which astonishes the reviewer; it is not because I believe the bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ to be a direct proof of our future life. Ewald evaporates this miracle, as Woolston did the whole history.

The reviewer's own theory, as above given in contradistinction to Ewald's, does not, however, satisfy me much better. The supposed "*extra-personal*" influence is not only undefined but even undescribed, and incapable apparently of intelligible description. He supposes "*some* presence visiting them, which they recognized in *some* way *inexplicable* to us, as that of a real person from the invisible world,—*an impression*, therefore, which had a *cause outside themselves*, and was not a mere product of the working of excited minds." But how were they sure it was outside themselves? is a fair question; and another is, How could they make us reasonably sure? It is not for me to deny the possibility of such *extra-personal* yet spiritual manifestations; and the reviewer does me great wrong to speak of me as "treating the supposition of any spiritual evidence of the resurrection as an absurdity;" still more, to make me say that the "access of the Father of our spirits to us through our souls is impassably closed up" (p. 40). What words of mine he alludes to, I cannot imagine, which bear this gloss and which he calls "offensive to the common belief of Christians." Were I, or the reviewer, to witness the same manifestation of the risen Christ as Paul did on his way to Damascus (which I take to have been a miraculous manifestation, and not wholly confined to St. Paul), I suppose we should "on equal evidence recognize as an objective reality the presence of a deceased person from the other world" (p. 41). But our question (in the reviewer's own words) has to do with the "*reality* of a resurrection *historically attested.*" And I confess I cannot see what historical evidence can be fairly admitted as credibly *proving to us* the reality of such a spiritual fact as the reviewer supposes. The bodily resurrection, as recorded in the Gospels, is a fair subject of testimony, to be tried

by the usual rules of testimony. But testimony to the supposed *spiritual fact* would amount, I think, only to this, that the person so testifying had a certain experience in his own mind which he referred to an *extra-personal* cause, but of which he can communicate no evidence, nor even clear description, to any one else. He therefore cannot satisfy any other person that this experience was anything but what the Germans call *subjective*, i.e. occurring in his own mind without any cause beyond the laws and operations of his own mind. I feel, therefore, that for the spiritual resurrection thus advocated, *no historical evidence can be brought that will or ought to satisfy my mind.* In order that I may partake that conviction, Christ must rise or ascend *to me*, as he is said to have risen or ascended to his first disciples individually. The process may indeed not have been in their case *subjective;* but if it cannot be shewn to have been otherwise, it might as well have been nothing else, so far as Christian evidences are concerned. We must each demand what Thomas so unreasonably did; and fail of being indulged as he was.

Let the reviewer be supposed to argue the case with Ewald. How will he prove that to have been *extra-personal* which Ewald regards as *subjective?* "*Some presence!*" (Ewald might reply); *what* presence, but that of their remembered Lord, as memory brought him back and faith exalted him? "They recognized it (you say) in *some way* inexplicable to us?" It is easily explicable to me (Ewald would say) as the working of their own excited minds; and in *what other way* can you even imagine it? You call it "a *spiritual* fact," designing by that phrase, you say, "to express a reality made cognizable and certain to a human soul through *some* other avenue than the outward senses." Again, *some* other avenue! What other? You define nothing. You make all vague. But be it so; still, how are they to make it certain (not being cognizable) to *other* minds? To *my* mind it is neither a subjective nor an objective reality through their mere narration of it. I admit it was *subjective* to them; but I must doubt its having been spiritually *objective* even to them, except as the modern American spiritualist finds Washington, Channing or his own relative, present when the proper *medium* is obtained. Indeed, the theory reflects the modern spiritualistic pretensions very closely. If Ewald or any one else should object thus, I know not what the reviewer could reply, unless he is prepared to say, As Christ's presence from the dead was manifested as a spiritual fact to each of the early Christians, so it has been spiritually manifested to *me;* and if it should become spiritually manifest to *you*, then you too will believe it. But this is abandoning the field of history and argument where we began with identifying the risen Christ. Is the reviewer prepared to maintain that this same spiritual fact of Christ's resurrection is *perpetual and universal*, — that the manifestation of the risen

Christ is a *constant law of the seen and unseen worlds?* For he says expressly that the persuasion was effected "not through the violation of any natural law, but in virtue of *some* deeper law affecting the relations of the seen and the unseen worlds, than we are yet able to trace." Yet he elsewhere speaks of a few rare and favoured moments when the veil has been pierced.

I do not know, by the by, why a miracle should be spoken of as a *violation* of natural law. When one natural law prevails over another, we do not say the first is violated. Gravitation is not violated, but overcome, by the natural power, whatever it be, by which the sap rises in the tree. Why should we say it was violated if Jesus Christ by special and supernatural power walked on the water? The natural law of disease is not violated when medicine prevails; why should we say it is when the miracle-working word of Christ prevails? Another and stronger power is brought into action, about which we may say something or may say nothing; but I would not say (for I do not know it and I do not think it) that any natural law is *violated*, but rather *overruled* by a higher natural law or by a supernatural will.

Let me here avow that I have no difficulty, as a Theist, in believing miracles to have been worked and inspired knowledge communicated through Jesus Christ and his apostles, at the will of the same beneficent Being who works continually in the powers of Nature. My acceptance of Christ's bodily re-appearance alive from the dead is in simple harmony with my admission of everything else miraculous about his ministry. I know not whether the reviewer denies the supernatural altogether; but if he does not in other recorded facts of the life and ministry of Jesus Christ, I do not see what advantage is gained to simplicity of theory by denying it in the instance of the resurrection. All the alleged miracles of the gospel history, including this, are, as described in the New Testament, of a kind that admits of testimony, for the conviction of others besides their immediate witnesses. They are all things addressed to the senses as well as to the mind. Even "the words that Christ speaks bear witness that the Father sent him," and he challenges those who do not believe his words to "believe his works." If, then, his resurrection were described in the New Testament as a *spiritual* fact only, it would be destitute of the evidence which belongs to all the rest. It might be fact, but not capable of reasonable proof.

The reviewer, in his letter to you, takes little notice of my main criticism, which I still venture to think is of chief importance in this question. I pointed out the scriptural fact that the ascension of our Lord is far less fully and circumstantially recorded and by a smaller number of historians (only by two, and those not apostles) than the resurrection. I said that his allegations and those of Ewald as to the vagueness and incompleteness of Christ's recorded appearances after death, would be much

more applicable to the scripture account of the ascension than to that of the resurrection, to which they have addressed the charge. For saying this, the reviewer invidiously tells you that I "all but throw overboard the New-Testament statement about the ascension." This is hardly fair.* I said nothing to warrant it. I said, as he does, "The ascension is the necessary sequel of a bodily resurrection." I not only "do not see how it can be got rid of," but I have never tried or wished to get rid of it. But I say now, as I have said already, that the scripture testimony on this subject is vague, shadowy and incomplete, especially when compared with the testimony to the resurrection of Christ. I believe it is unavoidably so. If his resurrection (his bodily resurrection and forty days' life on earth) was a fact, the testimonies would be, in the nature of things, so far *positive*. But the evidence of the ascension must be in a great degree *negative* and *inferential*. When Christ was seen again after death, it was thereby *known that he was risen;* when he was presently no more seen, it was thence *inferred that he had ascended*. There were no witnesses of the moment of his rising, but many of his having risen and being alive during forty days; and whatever witnesses there were of the moment of his ascension, the time following that event bore a merely negative witness to it by his being no more seen among his disciples. I repeat that what Ewald and his reviewer say of the vagueness of the history of the resurrection is far more applicable to that of the ascension. To those who had seen the risen Lord, his ascension was afterwards a necessary inference (as it is to us), whether they also had seen him in the act of ascending or not. I only propose to keep these two events separate (as the Gospels do) by an interval of forty days of well-attested bodily intercourse; whereas the reviewer still insists upon confounding or identifying them. Indeed, he does this more absolutely than ever in his letter to you, where he says (as already quoted), "There seems to me satisfactory evidence that Christ's resurrection *or* ascension (ἀνάστασις or ἀνάληψις), *whichever term we prefer* to adopt," &c. Now I prefer keeping both terms, and applying them, as the Scriptures do, to two different events, and judging of the evidence of each event separately. Here I seem hopelessly at issue with the reviewer, for I cannot admit his right to make the two terms interchangeable. To do so is politely to

* Elsewhere the reviewer says, my "peculiar cast of mind seems to disqualify (me) for doing full justice to views opposed to (my) own." It may be so with me, or with him; but if he consents to argue with me, he has no right (any more than I) to say it in disparagement of the opponent. My views also seem to him "in an unfixed and transitional state." Possibly; but they do not seem so to me. At least they have been long fixed in their present form. That the reviewer should send me (with another critic) to Mr. Holyoake to be *reprobated* for the *indecency* of affirmations never made by me, is, I think, a very low art in a scriptural critic of so free a cast as he. All these little arts of controversy were better avoided.

beg the question and ignore the gospel history. Indeed, that history is the chief obstacle in the way, and must be disparaged.

The reviewer is rather hard upon me in at once holding me responsible for all that Priestley and others have said about Christ's resurrection as a pledge of ours, and in also understanding me "to deny that the bodily resurrection of Christ could ever be, *or ever had been*, appealed to by intelligent persons as any ground of belief in human immortality." And to shew my denial of this last fact, he quotes my declaration that such persons "seem to me not to understand what they affirm." Then they do affirm it, at any rate. My allusion was not so much to what Priestley and others have written, as to what I (like the reviewer) have heard much more strongly stated by less competent but more dogmatic theologians. I alluded to the old Unitarian Baptist class especially, and my ministerial intercourse with them. For I think the reviewer overstates Priestley's meaning in the passages which he adduces. Priestley speaks of Christ's resurrection as "a *pledge* and *assurance* of our own which it is the great object of Christianity to enforce." But I have met with strenuous unlearned assertors of the opinion that Christ's risen body was truly the *pattern*, literally and absolutely the pattern, of ours, and that his rising miraculously proves that we shall naturally. I say such persons do not understand what they affirm. I am not aware that Priestley ever affirmed anything tantamount to this. Quite casually I stumble upon this passage in his *History of the Christian Church* (Rutt's edit., VIII. 23): "The consequence" (of his re-appearances to his disciples) "was such a firm persuasion in them all of the actual resurrection of their Master, and *consequently* of the *truth of his promises* concerning his second coming, to raise the dead and judge the world (when they would again enjoy his society in a state of happiness and glory which would have no end), as carried them through difficulties and sufferings as great as he himself had experienced, and gave *such an establishment to the Christian religion* as that nothing in the power of its most violent enemies and of the world could overturn it." As in this passage, so in many which might be brought from Priestley and others, the resurrection of Christ is cited as proof of his *divine authority*, the *truth of his claims*, and the reliableness of *all his instructions*, including his doctrine of *eternal life*. It is in this view that I regard the historical fact of Christ's resurrection as fundamentally important, and not as a "direct witness of a life beyond the terrestrial life." The reviewer is therefore not intitled to say that "the restoration of his earthly body had no bearing whatever on the *only* point that was of importance," and that the *only* sense in which his resurrection can be religiously of value to the dwellers on earth was as enabling them "to behold the σῶμα τῆς δόξης which their risen Lord wore in heaven."

I cannot even grant that (as he insists) it is exhibited in this latter light by St. Paul in the fifteenth chapter of his first Letter to the Corinthians. I think that chapter is often made to say a great deal more than Paul meant; and that persons of the class I have already alluded to, make Paul's argument illogical by trying to get more from it than he put into it. I think his argument from ver. 12 to 20 is a simple refutation of the sceptical assertion "that there is no resurrection of the dead." There were philosophers at Corinth, as at Athens, who mocked when the idea was mentioned, and who said the thing was impossible and absurd. Paul therefore, having rapidly cited the testimonies to the resurrection of Christ as that which he "had delivered to them first of all," says to the Corinthian Epicureans and those who were infected with their notions,—If Christ actually rose, how vain is it to say the thing is impossible! Positive testimony must outweigh negative arguments. One fact disproves universal negation. Thus he logically answers the sceptic on the abstract question. In the 35th verse he meets the practical difficulty of the thoughtful mind which still curiously asks, "*How* are the dead raised up, and *with what body* do they come?" And this question he meets, not (as I read him) by telling *how* and with *what body*, but by pointing to one illustration after another of the infinitely varied operations of God, and suggesting that the fact may be so though we do not know *how*. *How* does a seed grow? You know not; but you do not deny that it does, for you see the fact. How shall we live again? We know not; but He who has promised that we shall, can "give a body as it pleaseth Him." I hold this to be the course of *reasoning* in that eloquent chapter, in which some persons think the apostle finds not merely a reply to the sceptic, but positive proof of human immortality, and not merely grounds for faith in God's infinite power and love, but a literal description of the body that shall be.

Before quitting this chapter, I must express my surprise at the reviewer's argument on p. 44, that because Paul uses the same word, ὤφθη, for all the recorded manifestations of the risen Christ, whether to the apostles in Galilee during the forty days or to him years after on the way to Damascus, all those appearances must have been of the same kind. Surely this is a very forced argument. To me, who believe that the risen Christ was seen in bodily presence by Peter, then by the twelve, and after that by above five hundred brethren at once, then by James, then by all the apostles, and that the ascended Christ appeared afterwards by special miracle to Paul for his conversion, it seems perfectly natural that Paul should say, "Last of all *he was seen* of me also, as of one born out of due time." At least I know not how better he could have expressed what I understand him to have meant. Paul saw a miraculous vision; they had seen a risen man.

I am called upon by the reviewer "strongly to support" my "strong assertions" that to take Paul's visions of the Lord as the starting-point for an inquiry into the historical question of Christ's resurrection, is a "needless, if not wilful, inversion of the natural order of events." An *inversion* surely it is, as not even the reviewer thinks that Paul's vision of the risen Lord was the earliest in the order of events. I think it a needless inversion, and I think it not conducive to a clear view of the history; so I may perhaps be forgiven for the phrase "if not wilful," in reference to an inversion which seems to me only calculated to confuse the facts of the case and to serve a strange theory. My opinion is the stronger in reference to this inversion, because I deliberately hold that the first three Gospels were written *before the destruction of Jerusalem.** Here of course I differ from the reviewer, and must be content very briefly to say why. The positive testimonies of Clement and Irenæus in the second century throw us upon *internal* evidence for the little time preceding. And of course the internal evidence appears differently to different minds. To me it appears simply impossible that our Lord's prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem should have been written *as we have it* in the first three Gospels, except before that event occurred; for I know not how else to explain the presence, in that record, of Jewish expectations which were not fulfilled in the actual event. By the same criterion I am convinced that Paul's letters to the Thessalonians *must* have been written before the same event. So far as I know the literary history of ancient books, the authorship of the Gospels is quite as well proved as that of the Æneid, the Metamorphoses, the Gallic War and the Catilinian Conspiracy. So far as I can judge, the critical arguments which impugn the former would upset the latter. Thinking thus, I must consider it a strange inversion of the natural order of testimonies as well as events to begin the inquiry into Christ's resurrection (or any part of his personal history) with his miraculous appearance to Paul some years after his death, when we have two histories of his life written by apostles, and two others by men who had access to the earliest materials for a biography. The reviewer himself admits that the several Gospels "must have existed, and we find clear evidence of their materials *before*" the second half of the second century, when they are first distinctly alluded to. He also puts Luke long after Matthew and Mark, and John last of all, but still in the first century. Matthew and Mark may thus have been as early perhaps as I wish. But whatever theory we may hold respecting the earliest "materials," it seems to me that those materials, as now presented to us in

* The reviewer invidiously says, "As this is merely the opinion of an individual writer, unsupported by proof, we may set against it," &c. *Neither he nor I* have brought any proofs hitherto of our respective opinions on this subject. We have simply stated them. So far we are on a par in logic.

our Gospels, are the proper and only basis of our idea of *Christ's personal history*, including his death and resurrection. It is *wilful* to consult Paul on these subjects. It is doubtful whether Paul ever saw our Lord "in the flesh," though it is quite possible he may have done; but the vision which Paul had of him some years after his resurrection is, I must think, most arbitrarily and unnaturally taken as interpretive of what his biographers have said of his previous personality, whether before or immediately after his death. This is what I mean by a needless, if not wilful, inversion.

I must speak my whole mind plainly here. It seems to me that the historical character and the historical evidences of Christianity are wholly invalidated by the reviewer's theory, as well as by Ewald's. It seems to me that by simply extending the application of the same mode of argument, a Woolston, a Strauss or a Holyoake may call in question everything alleged to have been miraculous in the personal history of Jesus Christ, and may even reduce his earthly life itself to that of a phantom Christ such as the reviewer reminds us that the Docetæ maintained him to have been. The argument would run thus: "Paul had seen, by *extra-personal* but *not miraculous* manifestations, the ascended Christ. What Paul knew by these manifestations we take as the 'proper point of departure' for our knowledge of Christ, because Paul's Epistles were written before any of the Gospels. Now Paul does not give us any account of those miraculous cures and inspired sayings of Christ which the evangelists afterwards published. Indeed he scarcely alludes, in any of his letters, to any passage of Christ's earthly life preceding his crucifixion. Even in his preaching as recorded in the book of the Acts (which book is, however, no more reliable than Luke's Gospel in these matters) he makes little allusion to Jesus Christ personally except as then *risen from the dead*. His risen state is therefore *the whole gospel according to Paul*. But that risen state was a *spiritual manifestation to believers only*; whence we infer that the same was the case with all previous manifestations, which *gradually assumed the form of bodily appearances, especially as the fervour of the primitive faith abated* (p. 44). I conclude therefore, with those ancient spiritualists called Gnostics, that he had no real flesh, no real body, but only the appearance of it, and that he did not really die."

What could the reviewer reply to this? He himself brings the Docetæ into the argument, and conjectures that when these *knowing people* were "changing the earthly life of Christ into a phantom, the mass of Christians opposed to these fancies had *a strong motive*, operating perhaps *unconsciously*, to understand the traditional account of Christ's spiritual intercourse with his disciples after his death, in a more outward and corporeal sense, lest they should be used to justify applying to the terrestrial

ministry of Christ what was true only of his heavenly life." Then, according to the reviewer, it would have been a natural process of thought so to apply such expressions. The Docetæ had, on the reviewer's theory, just so much groundwork for their fancy which they had not on mine. A modern Docete has only to take up the argument where the reviewer has left it, and say that, unconsciously, the whole phantom life of Christ has been hardened into bodily and outward history.

But these Docetic fancies were early confronted by more literal and historical-minded Christians, who in point of fact, however, do not assert the reality of the resurrection with any such special emphasis as the reviewer's theory would lead us to expect. There is no appearance of its having been newly brought into the region of outward objective fact. The whole life, death and resurrection had been *alike* unrealized by these Gnostics, and the reality of *all alike* is insisted upon by others. An extract from Ignatius directly to the point will shew this: "Turn a deaf ear, then, as often as any one speaks to you *without* Jesus Christ (χωρὶς), who was of the race of David, who was Mary's son, who was *really* (ἀληθῶς) born, and ate and drank, was *really* persecuted under Pontius Pilate, was *really* crucified and died (both those in heaven and on earth and under the earth being spectators of it), who was also *really* raised from the dead, his Father raising him, as in like manner his Father will also raise up us who believe in Jesus Christ, without whom (οὗ χωρὶς) we have not the true life. But if, as some (being atheists, that is, unbelievers) say, that he suffered in appearance (τὸ δοκεῖν πεπονθέναι αὐτὸν), they themselves existing only in appearance! (αὐτοὶ ὄντες τὸ δοκεῖν), why am I bound?" &c. (Ignat. Ep. to Trallians, ii. 10—13.) A similar enumeration of the realities of Christ's life, death and resurrection, occurs in the same Father's letter to the Smyrnæans (i. 4—12). It is even more emphatic and minute than that above quoted. It shews that in his time (and he was martyred A.D. 107) the Docetæ denied *all the outward realities alike*, and the realists asserted *the reality of all alike*. There is no sign, I believe, of the separate and later hardening of the resurrection into outward fact, or of the evaporation of less than the whole by the Gnostic still. And the good Father, wittily as logically, evaporates his opponents in their own laboratory: "*they themselves existing only in appearance*"!

Another thing I must say, and with a seriousness beyond my own impression of the importance of the matter of comparison, but at the risk of seeming far too little serious to those who believe in its pretensions and also to the *National Reviewer*. I can draw no clear line of distinction between the spiritualistic philosophy of the reviewer and that of our mesmerists, table-turners, clairvoyants, rappers, revivalists and others, who now arrogate and (as I think) degrade the name of "Spiritualist." I

suppose all these enthusiasts would, like the reviewer, indignantly repudiate Ewald's theory that what they attest is merely *subjective;* they all maintain that the communications received by them are "extra-personal," "having a cause outside themselves." They think it necessary to suppose "*some* presence visiting them, which they recognize in *some* way inexplicable by us as that of a real person from the invisible world." The very language of the reviewer describes their pretensions precisely. Are we then to put the gospel evidences on a level with the claims of the Ploughkeepsie Andrew Davis and the Wilkinsonian visions? Should I ever find them on a level in my mind, I must certainly cease to regard Christianity as a divine revelation. At present I do look upon it (together with the preparatory steps of revelation) as in this clear sense "an isolated event, a fact *sui generis*, in the course of human affairs." If I could reduce it to the same *genus* with those spiritual facts which I now refer to the constant laws of the human mind and body, I might still maintain a high and noble Theism, but I would drop the name Christian, as I would shun that of Mesmerist or Table-turner.

I must hasten to a conclusion. But I cannot help reminding you, Sir, and your readers, that the substance of this same discussion appeared in your pages about three years ago as part of a larger one, purposely raised by the Rev. J. J. Tayler, "On the State of Religion in Germany and among Unitarians in England." (C. R., Oct. 1856, to Sept. 1857.) In the last of three very interesting letters addressed to you on this subject, Mr. Tayler, after describing the "Gustavus-Adolphus Union" of the German Lutheran and Reformed Churches, opened for home discussion the question of a possible closer union among ourselves, and suggested that this might be found in "the acceptance of the life of Christ as the type of our own." Incidentally he gave his reasons for not implying in his proposed bond of union the recognition of the miraculous in Christianity, though himself believing it, and also for not including any opinion on Christ's resurrection and ascension. (C. R., 1857, p. 94.) On this last subject he gave expression to views remarkably coincident with those of the present *National Reviewer*. The whole materials of thought thus offered by him were discussed, as he had requested, in a very amicable but thorough manner, by Messrs. Gordon, Greg, Solly, Freeman, H. J. Prescott, Higginson, Tagart and Long; by one or other of whom the suggested bond of union was declared (if I must not say shewn) to be impracticable except so far as already in practice, and the spiritual resurrection theory was critically called in question, but without evoking any reply whatever from Mr. Tayler. If any of your readers will be at the trouble to consult your volumes for 1856 and 1857, to which I have referred, they will find the sum and substance of this present discussion between the *National Reviewer* and myself,

with other topics of equal interest to English Unitarian Christians. They will also find in C. R., May, 1856, a most curious article on "Table-turning in Ancient Times," from Mr. Tayler's learned pen.

A UNITARIAN MINISTER.

THE UNITARIAN LAYMAN'S REJOINDER TO THE NATIONAL REVIEWER.

SIR,

PERSONAL discussions in your pages are undesirable, and if in my letter in your December number I departed in any way from this principle, and referred more directly than I should otherwise have thought of doing to the author of the article on the Apostolic Age in the *National Review*, it was, as I explained, solely on account of the public position which he occupies, and because I feel that if the Theological Professor of Manchester College chooses to address the world on subjects so directly connected with the office which he holds, he has no moral right to assume the incognito.

But though I think that questions affecting the resurrection of Christ and the authority of the gospel narratives, and the manner in which these questions are dealt with by the Theological Professor of Manchester College, may be fit subjects for discussion in your pages, I have little disposition to occupy the attention of your readers by much notice of those portions of the recent letter of your correspondent which are personal to myself. In the previous letter which appeared in your columns, I quoted largely the reviewer's own words, stated the inferences to which they appeared to me to be open, and left to your readers the opportunity of judging whether those inferences were legitimate or not. Your correspondent has, generally speaking, adopted with regard to me a different course, and has spoken of me in terms which are rather the expression of his own opinions than deductions supported by any argument. Such opinions from some quarters would have given me serious concern, and led me anxiously to review the course I have taken. But men to whose judgment I attach higher value than I do to that of the reviewer have expressed their approval of what I have written, and as they have thought me in no degree obnoxious to the imputations which the reviewer brings, I regard with great indifference the terms which he has applied to me. The real offence which I have committed in the eyes of the reviewer is that, exercising my own judgment, I have stated in your pages what I believe to be the insufficiency and weakness of the arguments, and the unsoundness of the conclusions, which have been brought forward

in the pages of the *National Review* upon some subjects of the highest interest to mankind. On these subjects the reviewer, at all events, has put forth opinions at variance with those which have been held by men his equals in learning, his equals in freedom of thought and action, and in my belief far his superiors in mental power, and which are also held, I believe, by men as conversant as the reviewer with the learning of the present day. In connection with these subjects I have further raised the question, painfully forced upon myself, whether the manner in which the reviewer has dealt with them in his published writings does not indicate his unfitness at essential points for the important public office which he fills. If in examining the opinions of the reviewer, and the grounds upon which they rest, I have failed to make out my case in the judgment of your readers, my failure will have its own reward. But the question will not be settled by the opinions expressed of me by the reviewer.

One or two remarks it may perhaps be well that I should make. With reference to the imputation of dogmatism, the objections I made are not to the holding of any particular opinions, but to unfairness of statement and unsoundness of argument, qualified in every instance by the declaration that I believe such unfairness to be unconscious, not intentional. I am further told that of the reviewer's teaching I have no means of judging. What I said had reference to his published writings. But in the foregoing statement, as in some points of much greater importance, the reviewer has made a most extraordinary assumption; the fact being, I believe, that few people living have had a larger experience of his teaching than myself, or, I will venture to add, have listened to it with greater interest or warmer personal attachment. Its excellences at many points, which I have ever gratefully recognized, have not made me blind to defects which may, I fear, be essentially mischievous in the position which the reviewer now occupies. I wish also to say that as the terms in which he has spoken of me have given me no concern, they will, I can assure him, have no place in my recollection. I well know that it must be a source of sorrow to him that one who was once his pupil, and has long been his friend, should publicly appear as his opponent. If this has been painful to him, I can assure him that it has been painful to me. But I do not hold that personal friendship is a ground for failure in the discharge of duty. When the reviewer stated doubts as to the authority of the gospel narratives of the resurrection, I felt it right to examine the grounds on which he did so, and I am not prepared, under his censure, to withdraw a word of what I have written.

The reviewer says that I have been writing on subjects of which I am imperfectly informed, and intimates, not very indirectly, that it might have been as well had I remained silent. On this point I have a few words to say. I make no pretension

to be in learning the equal of the reviewer. It would be absurd in me to do so. The advantage to society of the existence of a body of clergy (and I would not be understood as undervaluing the clerical profession when I say that it is the only advantage I know of) is that, being regularly instructed in the knowledge of religion in the large sense of the term, and making the study and teaching of religion the main duty of their lives, they may give to the subject that special attention which, in the necessary division of human occupations and duties, tends to the attainment of excellence in each, and which, in the particular case before us, is especially valuable for the attainment of those qualifications which may enable some men to be the instructors of others in the paths of duty and happiness. On this ground I am an advocate for the maintenance of the clerical profession, and for a national religious establishment, which shall supply the means of religious instruction without compelling the acceptance of it in any particular form. But if the principle is to be carried to the extent that professed theologians alone are to judge of religious questions, this, I may remark, is the ground upon which the Church of Rome excludes the laity from the reading of the Bible, and on which Pusey and Newman have maintained that the people are not to judge upon questions of belief except under the superintendence and guidance of the clergy. The learning of your correspondent I trust that I hold in all due respect. Upon his conclusions I take the liberty of judging for myself; and where in his published writings he appears to me to state questions unfairly or draw conclusions unwarrantably, I shall take the liberty of entertaining, and, if I think fit, of expressing, dissent. The article in the *National Review* appeared to me remarkable for glaring defects of statement and argument. The grounds on which I thought so have been placed before your readers, and it is unnecessary that I should refer to them again, except for the purpose of stating that the subsequent letter of the reviewer has in no degree qualified the opinions which I have expressed, though it has undoubtedly made some points clear which the article in the *National* left very much otherwise. When the reviewer declares his belief in the resurrection of Christ, which was however, in his view, not a bodily resurrection, but the appearance of a spiritual form, I must declare that with such a view I can have no sympathy, and can entertain no high opinion of the soundness of the reviewer's judgment or the clearness of his perceptions. I am at a loss indeed to discover upon what support, save the imagination of the reviewer, such an opinion can rest at all. That which the reviewer now states as the opinion of Ewald apart from his own, is to me far more clear and intelligible. Ewald, according to the statement of the reviewer, holds that the resurrection of Christ from the dead is not supported by satisfactory evidence. The reviewer declares his belief

in the resurrection, whilst denying the fidelity of the narratives upon which the resurrection depends as an historical fact. Briefly, as I have in substance stated before, the adoption of the reviewer's views as to the gospel narratives would involve with me the rejection of Christianity as a divine communication from God to mankind, and the substitution of Deism in its place. Admitting the reviewer's premises, my conclusion from them must be that of Ewald, not that of the reviewer.

Whether the teaching of the reviewer in the Theological Chair of Manchester College may be in accordance with his style of writing in the *National Review*, I can have no knowledge. Generally speaking, I should say that any defects of statement which appear in the written words which a man deliberately gives to the world, are far more likely to exist in oral instruction; and of such defects the pupils who trust to him without other guidance are far more likely than any one else to be unconscious.

I assure the reviewer that I have as little inclination as he can have to pursue the question with him. Whilst I have listened during many years with high gratification and advantage to his teaching upon all subjects connected with practical Christianity, I have never been able to find either pleasure or instruction in his theological speculations. Happily, these were not often brought before his congregation, and what I know of them is in some measure derived from writings understood to be his in periodical publications, where, however, unless when I am led to do so as a necessary duty, I have long ceased to read them.

In directing attention to the subject, my object has been answered, and I now leave the judgment of these questions in the hands of your readers. Again expressing my warm personal regard and friendship for my opponent,

I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

AN UNITARIAN LAYMAN.

Singleton, Manchester, Jan. 6, 1860.

P.S. Since the foregoing was written, I have learned accidentally that the reviewer has felt aggrieved at a supposed imputation in my former letter of unfaithfulness as a teacher. Now unfaithfulness as a teacher implies, I apprehend, the intention or the consciousness of teaching unfairly. This I never, in word or thought, attributed to the reviewer. In my former letter I said (C. R. p. 717), "Intentional unfairness in argument I have never for one moment thought of imputing to the excellent person who is the subject of my present remarks." I beg now to assure him (though I should have thought it almost needless) that I had just as little idea of imputing to him intentional unfairness in any way.

SCRIPTURAL HYMNS. By SIR JOHN BOWRING.

No. IX.

"Rejoice in the Lord" (Psalm xxxiii. 1).

Rejoice in the Lord for ever,
In the Lord for ever rejoice;
Devoutly listen wherever
Is heard his whispering voice;
For oft that voice is speaking
In tones most sweetly soft,
In thunders sometimes breaking,
In sacred silence oft.

In moving constellations
That circle their spheres above;
In marvellous manifestations
Of music and life and love;
To the worthless audible solely
In the boisterous cataract's fall;
To the humble, the pure, the holy,
Heard everywhere, heard in all.

No. X.

"Now let me die" (Kings xix. 4).

"Now let me die!" the prophet said;
Enough of life, its wants and woes;
Where my forefathers trod I tread,
And would repose where they repose.

"Now let me die!" the good may say;
The pilgrim and the pilgrimage
Have reached the hour of life's decay,
And tremble 'neath the shocks of age.

"Now let me die!" the Christian cries;
The world is fading, and I see
Bright angels beckoning from the skies,
And opening gates of heaven for me.

"Now let me die!" When Jesus' voice
Shall call to immortality,
In the blest summons I'll rejoice,
And meekly answer, "Let me die!"

DAWN OF THE NEW REFORMATION IN ITALY.

SIR,

STUDIES in which I have for some time been specially engaged in connection with the Papacy and its influences have left in my mind an undoubting assurance that at least in its political relations it is hastening to its doom. The same studies have given me an intense desire for its downfal; for beyond a question fearfully baneful is its operation on individuals and society, as will fully be shewn in my volume on "*The Confessional*" about to issue from the press. Among the indications of the tottering condition of the Papal throne which I have lately seen is an instructive essay in *Le Lien* of Nov. 26, 1859, written by Mons. Etienne Coquerel. Having myself found its contents interesting, I send you the substance of them in a translation, not doubting that they will prove interesting to your readers.

Manchester, Dec. 9, 1859. JOHN R. BEARD.

IN the 16th century there was a flourishing and harmonious Italian church, but persecution destroyed it, and all the members who did not perish sought a refuge, which did not fail them, in England, Switzerland and Germany. After that, there was not the least trace of Protestantism in all the Peninsula, except two small communities at Leghorn and Venice. For more than two hundred years, English and German merchants had been drawn within these commercial towns for business purposes, and when there united in worship. Without being actuated by any great sympathy with Protestantism, the Tuscan and Venetian governments had left them alone, the interests of commerce prevailing over those of fanaticism. These two communities still exist. At Leghorn the number of Protestants is 650, and the worship is conducted in German and French. At Venice the community consists of 400 members, and depends upon the ecclesiastical association at Vienna. The worship is conducted in German, in an ancient Catholic church which the Protestants bought before Venice belonged to Austria. Forty years ago these congregations and the Vaudois church were the sole representatives of the Protestant faith in Italy. There were, however, Protestants in several other towns; but not before 1820 were they able, in Turin, Florence, Rome and Naples, to connect themselves with the embassies of the Protestant powers, and thus to acquire an existence somewhat less precarious. At Rome, the church is under the protection of the Prussian ambassador, whose chaplain officiates as pastor to the community. They possess a very convenient chapel, a school, a hospital, and several other charitable institutions. The permanent members of the congregation number about 150; however, many strangers join at certain seasons of the year, and at Christmas and Easter the average number of communicants is about 300. The service of

the church is conducted in German and sometimes in French. There is also outside the gates of Rome an English chapel. The Papal government tolerates its existence, but only until it can be put down without danger; meanwhile, the government interdicts any manifestation which would place Protestantism before the public. Thus in case of the death of a Protestant, the friends are prevented from placing an inscription upon the tomb in any way indicating the religion of the deceased; all passages of scripture are forbidden for the same reason.

At Naples there are 700 or 800 Protestants, who possess a church and maintain a French pastor; however, in consequence of being connected with the Prussian embassy, they enjoy the services of the ambassador's chaplain. There is also an English congregation in the town, which has for its minister the chaplain of the British embassy.

In Sicily they have not yet succeeded in organizing a permanent German congregation. However, at Messina, where about 100 German and Swiss Protestants live, there is a theological student of German origin, who officiates as both schoolmaster and pastor. This congregation is often enlarged by English families who take up their abode at Messina for the season.

There is an English chapel at Palermo, but in the two last-mentioned towns the Protestant services are not officially recognized, and they content themselves with a simple private worship.

There were a certain number of Protestants among the Swiss troops of the King of Naples, who endeavoured for a time to re-establish a system of charity, regulated and recognized by the government. But their efforts were in vain.

At Rome it is much the same; some Protestants who are engaged in the foreign regiments of the Pope generally conceal their religious position.

It is doubtful whether the Papal government ignores the fact of having Protestants in its service; but at least it acts as if such were the case: for in case of illness or death the soldiers are strictly prohibited from seeing any minister of the Protestant faith.

There are more Protestants in the north of the Peninsula than in the south. We have already mentioned the two ancient churches of Leghorn and Venice. There is also one at Florence, which has been connected with the Prussian embassy since 1827, which consists of 300 members. The service is conducted in German, French and Italian, by their pastor, M. Shafter, of Berne.

There are 1000 Protestants in Modena, 300 in Parma, 40 in Bologna and in Reggio, 44 in Ancona; but all are nearly destitute of religious resources.

Fortunately this is not the case at Milan, where there are 400 or 500 Protestants, mostly of German origin. Until 1848, they

had only private worship; but the events of that year enabled them to invite as pastor a M. Kind.

When the Austrian armies returned to the capital of Lombardy, the clergy wished to prevent the continuation of this service. But Marshal Radetsky, having a more liberal mind, determined that this should not be allowed. He placed the community under his protection; and the clerical opposition had to yield before his all-powerful will. The service is now conducted in French and German. Bergamo for fifty years has had a congregation of about 200 members, the majority being foreigners, for whom the service is conducted in German and Italian. Lastly, for a long time, there have been two French Protestant settlements at Genoa and Nice. All these communities, as the reader will observe, have in common the feature of being composed of foreigners, and not Italians. Except in one or two places, the worship is conducted in a foreign language. Thus for many years little influence has been exercised upon the mass of the population; and it is certain that if a Protestant movement broke out at the present moment in Italy, the glory and responsibility would belong rather to foreigners than to Italians.

During the last ten years, however, Italy has seen other churches form themselves within her borders. Put in possession of full liberty, the Vaudois have built temples at Geneva, Turin, Pignerol, &c.; and the authorities of the churches have made known to the world what has been effected by their members.

However, it is not likely that the Vaudois church is called to play a prominent part in the evangelization of Italy; many circumstances oppose it, besides the fact that the mass of the Vaudois population speak only French. The establishment of these temples has exercised, nevertheless, a good influence upon the people. The mere fact of their existence has shewn many Italians that there is such a thing as Protestantism.

By the side of the Vaudois church in Piedmont some purely Italian congregations have established themselves. M. de Sanctis presides over the one at Turin, and M. Mazzarella at Genoa. Their influence upon their countrymen is so marked, that lately in Montreux (Canton de Vaud) a meeting of 50 Italian converts took place, to deliberate upon the means of propagating their new faith in their native land. Scarcely a year ago this religious movement was entirely confined to Piedmont. It had, it is true, extended a little into Tuscany; and there are some small congregations in Pisa, Florence, and some other villages and towns of the Grand Duchy. They had outlived the persecutions connected with the affair of the Madiai; but the constant surveillance of a subtle police prevented the movement from extending. Since the war all has changed. The Duchies and Legations have proclaimed liberty of worship and the legal religious equa-

lity of all citizens. Our Italian co-religionists have with a rare energy availed themselves of this liberty so new to them; and the religious societies of Switzerland, France and England, have lent them the only assistance which, on the part of Protestant foreigners, can be really useful to Italians. They have furnished them with religious books and Bibles in abundance.

A correspondent of the *Times* writes to that paper from Florence—"I have seen in Parma, Bologna and other places, signal proofs of the activity of the London Bible Societies. Beautiful editions of the Diodati Bible, or the Protestant translations of the Old and New Testament, are sold at a very low price, or distributed gratuitously by the agents of these societies."

The Geneva Journal confirms these facts. A correspondent writes to it from Turin—"In the neighbourhood of Forli, a pamphlet, entitled *Christ without the Pope*, has been circulated and much read among the people. This pamphlet is very simple and at the same time very religious."

This diffusion of Protestant books, so eagerly caught at by many, has already produced results sufficiently considerable to shew how well the ground has been prepared. At Milan the worship is celebrated with a publicity unknown at the time of the Austrian dominion. And the Official Gazette of that city published so favourable an article upon these Bible Societies and their operations, that the Ultramontane French primal *L'Univers* uttered thereupon cries of rage.

In Tuscany, however, a very considerable Protestant outburst has taken place. The *Magazin de Librairie* (25th of July) says, "There are already more than 20,000 new converts in Tuscany: this is really enormous, when we take into consideration the hindrances which the government has placed in the way of the missionaries.

"It is not in the higher classes of society where Protestantism makes the most converts, but in the middle and especially among the lower classes. Meanwhile the sect which has undertaken the conversion of Tuscany is the most rigid of all the sects of Protestantism. It proscribes the clergy, and in consequence religious ceremonies: every Christian is a priest, and every place may become a temple. The spirit of Puritanism is revived in its followers, and I ask, how can they obtain any success among a poetic people, in a country where everything addresses the imagination, the inhabitants of which have always been somewhat paganish, and where there is no faith except in a visible religion? If the Italians turn to Puritanism, we must indeed believe they are changed."

The Protestants of Tuscany being free and numerous, wished to put themselves in possession of all their rights, and accordingly have set about erecting a place of worship. An elegant structure is rising in Florence upon the Piazza Barbano, which

is called also the Place of Independence. It is destined to become a temple dedicated to the worship of the *National Italian Church*, or the *Reformed Catholic Church*. Thus a congregation separated from the established Catholic Church already exists in Florence, and since last April the Protestant service has been conducted publicly in the Italian language.

In this movement the laity are not left to themselves. The clergy, especially in the lower ranks, participate in it. We find on this point some curious statements in the Genevan journal:

"What must greatly contribute to disquiet the clergy, is the fact, that by the side of the Protestant tendency, properly so called, there is another tendency very prominent,—a tendency to renovation, nay, if you will, to revolt, among the ecclesiastics. At Milan, Florence, and even at Turin, the priests profess openly what is called the *Catholic reformation* of the church.

"In Piedmont, Lombardy, there are 100 priests, more or less known, who have separated themselves from the episcopal government, and who act and write in a most liberal way. At this moment the people of Florence are erecting an edifice which has been named the *National Church*. The Florentine people are very interesting and very intelligent, and receive these demonstrations of religious liberty with great pleasure." "Even in the states of the Pope the movement against the ecclesiastical authority is extending."

It is now seen that the north of Italy is in a state of religious ferment. We do not see only small isolated congregations formed of English and Swiss merchants, who celebrate their worship in a foreign language, but purely Italian congregations are arising on the same ground. A religious question has been put before the nation, and an important movement already agitates the country after only a few months' liberty of conscience.

We will not say, with the correspondents of several foreign journals, that the King Victor Emmanuel, threatened with an interdict from the Pope, is prepared, in case the Pontifical thunder-bolt strikes him, to abjure the Catholic faith; and that the whole of his people would become Protestants together with him.

We do not seriously believe these rumours, nor do we like conversions dictated by political considerations. But without indulging in these dreams, actual facts suffice; and we hail with joy the serious movement which is bursting forth in a country for which the Protestant faith would be the greatest of benefits, and which has shewn itself worthy of the boon.

Intelligence from Florence, dated the 30th of November, 1859, states that the Evangelical movement in that city daily acquires larger proportions. More than a thousand Italians assemble every Sunday evening for public worship in a hall which serves for a chapel. The new community are impatiently expecting more capacious accommodation. It comprises at least three hun-

dred communicants. The Sunday anterior to the date given above, some thirty ministers took part in the services. Similar meetings have been organized in the principal cities of Tuscany and Romagna. On all sides Bibles are distributed. With peculiar satisfaction we learn that the new congregations have no authoritative creeds, nor any clergy regularly consecrated; their ministers simply declare that their faith rests on the gospel, under the aid and guidance of free inquiry. Their most highly gifted preacher is Mazzarella, of Naples. Besides the Sunday services, several meetings take place during the week.

While Italy offers so many and so marked signs of religious revival, France is by no means without tokens of the approach of a brighter day. To say nothing of the anti-papistical tendency of Louis Napoleon's Italian policy, the efficiency of which is attested by the episcopal alarms and agitation lately obtruded on the public view, we find in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, which, standing at the head of the periodical literature of France, is the sole voice of the press that retains something which approaches real liberty, unmistakeable indications of the decline of Romanism in popular favour, and of the coming-in of a purer and more living form of Christian faith. A few months since, Mons. Rénan, an author of high repute, who has largely contributed to the influence of Dr. Channing's works in France, published a very superior translation of the book of Job. An elaborate review of this valuable contribution to French theological literature lately appeared in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*. To the surprise of thousands and to the gratification of hundreds, the essay bore as the name of its author the signature of *A. Réville*. The surprise and the gratification arose from the fact that the writer is a well-known Protestant clergyman. Never before had a Huguenot minister been permitted to contribute to the pages of the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, the great national Review of Catholic France. Moreover, the Rev. A. Réville holds a high place in the liberal section of the French Protestant Church; in other words, his cast of thought is essentially and thoroughly Unitarian. The importance of the fact is anything but lessened by the outcry raised by the appearance of his admirable essay in periodicals devoted to French Protestant orthodoxy.

However, in the number of the *Revue des Deux Mondes* published on the 12th December, 1859, a more decided demonstration of the leaning of its conductors makes its appearance. In a critical notice of two devotional works by a Protestant lady, M. Emile Montégut uses these remarkable words: "For myself, I will boldly declare that I have felt true satisfaction in reading these two consolatory books, written by a Protestant pen. I am delighted to see that they have been inspired by the religious doctrine which is accounted by the vulgar as the most pedantic, austere and frowning—that which gives religious consolation most coldly and most grudgingly. I have long known that these

are calumnies, and very happy am I to meet with a proof which confirms my sympathies. Noble Church, which in the midst of universal decay still countest among its members so many loyal and valiant souls! Courage! One way or another, a great future is reserved for thee! We speak in parables, and in a way not to be comprehended by the profane, but to be understood only by those concerned." Here follows the parable. The conversation in which Jesus asks Peter, "Lovest thou me?"—one of the Papal commonplaces—is the theme of this apologue; in which Christ is made to utter severe reproaches against Peter, the chosen representative of the Catholic Church, saying, among other things, "Pharisaism shall seize thee; thou wilt persecute the innocent and shed the blood of the just; thou art guided by instinct only; another (Luther is meant) shall come and lead thee whither thou wouldst not go—the apostle of the living word and of justification by faith." Sinking indeed is the Papal system in France when it has not power to keep words like these out of the highest and most influential of its current literary organs.

THEODORE PARKER.

"SWEEP all the miracles away,
And there is more of glory left
Than beams on summer's brightest day,
Of mists, of clouds bereft.

"Sweep all the miracles away;
His word, his work, his high intent,
Are sacred more, more blest than they,
More true, more eloquent!

"Sweep all the miracles away,
And then sublime the Saviour stands,
A solid pile midst wrecks of clay,
A house not made with hands."

'Tis a grand picture,—when I read
The records and the musings o'er,
All that he sees I see indeed,
All, all, but something more.

That *something more* invites me now,
From heaven's high arch I track it down,
It lights upon the Saviour's brow,
A wreath, a glorious crown.

Its rays grow heavenlier as I gaze,
Fairer and farther still they shine;
I know not *how* divine those rays,
I feel they *are* divine.

J. B.

THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS, BY SIR JOHN BOWRING.*

SIR JOHN BOWRING is employing the evening of a more than usually active and useful life in recording some of his experiences in the East, and giving an enduring form to some of the varied stores of geographical and other knowledge which he has had the opportunity of gathering.

Few men possess natural gifts equal to his in respect to the facility of acquiring languages, and few have gone through a better preparatory training for making good use of foreign experiences. First as a merchant, he became familiar with the commercial resources and usages of all the principal European states. It was a fortunate circumstance for his country that before he had reached middle life he became the confidential associate of the celebrated Jeremy Bentham, and drank in from the teachings of that great political philosopher the first principles of legislation and government. When he came to apply the economical principles which he had learnt, he saw how grievously international trade was hampered and national wealth squandered by commercial restrictions. He thus became one of the early pioneers of that movement which resulted in the triumph, under Sir Robert Peel's Government, of the principles of Free Trade. If the prospect which has just opened upon the world of the adoption of the principle by our great neighbour in France, shall be fully realized, the result may be alike enduring and beneficial to the two countries and to all the world.

It was, we believe, in 1828 that Sir John (then Mr.) Bowring commenced his public services by undertaking, at the request of Mr. Herries, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, a mission to Holland to report on the public accounts of that country. For this office he was recommended by Mr. A. Baring (Lord Ashburton) and the Parliamentary Finance Committee. In 1832, he was nominated Secretary to the Commission for the Reform of the Public Accounts. He familiarized himself with the details of the public accounts of France, and his reports on the whole subject were presented to Parliament. Conjointly with Sir Henry Parnell, he prepared the reports and resolutions respecting the Exchequer which ultimately became the law of public accountancy in Great Britain and our colonies. In 1831, he received the appointment of Commercial Commissioner to France, being on this occasion united with Lord Clarendon. The result was certain modifications of the tariff, the first of a series of concessions which have had the effect of twice quadrupling our exports to France, and of quintupling the exports from that country to England. Recent events seem destined to give new and unex-

* A Visit to the Philippine Islands. By Sir John Bowring, LL.D., F.R.S., late Governor of Hong Kong, H.B.M.'s Plenipotentiary in China. 8vo. Pp. 434. London—Smith, Elder and Co., Cornhill.

pected value to the two elaborate reports presented by the Commissioners to Parliament on our commercial relations with France. It would be carrying us beyond our present purpose were we to mention in detail the public commercial missions undertaken by Sir John Bowring, the results of which are in the possession of Parliament. It is sufficient to say that they relate to Belgium, Egypt, Syria, Lombardy, Tuscany, Rome and Switzerland. In 1838, he represented his country at Berlin, at the meeting of the Zollverein. Of all the reports in which Sir John has had a hand, none has proved more fruitful in legislative and commercial results than that on Import Duties presented by Mr. Hume's Committee. It has been translated into all the commercial languages of Europe. Many of its recommendations, it is well known, were adopted by Sir Robert Peel.

It was in 1849 that Sir John was sent out to Canton as consul; in 1853 he became superintendent of trade and plenipotentiary to China; in 1854 he became governor of Hong Kong and chief superintendent of trade. It was in the year following that he negotiated the treaty with Siam. Of his account of his visit to that interesting country, our pages have given a brief review. The trade created by that treaty is already of vast amount. Where six ships a-year were engaged at Bangkok, now nearly two hundred yearly resort. Of the extraordinary difficulties which arose in China during his government, we need not speak. Freely as his public conduct in the East has been made the sport of party warfare, the general results sufficiently prove him to have been a sagacious and not unsuccessful representative and guardian of the interests of Great Britain under circumstances of peculiar peril. The trade with China rapidly grew under his government. Of that trade, bullion and opium represent in money value a greater amount than all other exports and imports together. But independently of these two principal items, the import trade of China rose in the five years of his government from about 5½ million dollars to upwards of 32 million dollars. At Hong Kong, free trade in the same period doubled the annual income and diminished the annual average Parliamentary grant from £16,340 to £880.

When a public officer is able to adduce services and results like these, he may safely leave his reputation in the hands of his countrymen.

The literary habits of Sir John Bowring, coupled with his indefatigable energy, enable him to render not unimportant collateral services to his country, by recording in volumes attractive to all classes of intelligent readers what he has seen and heard in his novel Eastern voyages and travels.

The visit to the Philippine Islands, of which one result is the publication of this handsome and interesting volume, took place in the latter part of 1858, when "illness and the despotism of

the doctors" compelled Sir John Bowring, by a few weeks' voyage and absence from the heavy cares of colonial government, to seek a renovation of health. He wisely directed his course to the Eastern Spanish Archipelago and its group of islands, of which hitherto European knowledge has been small and unsatisfactory. These islands are situated in the Eastern Sea, and lie between the 5th and the 20th degree of north latitude. The voyage from Hong Kong to Manila, the capital of the island of Luzon, was made in the Queen's ship Magicienne (Capt. Vansittart), and was accomplished, despite of the tempestuous sea and its wild cross waves, in five days. Manila, the capital of the Philippine Islands, is situated on the left bank of the river Pasig. One of the first objects to attract the attention of the traveller approaching the capital by its "silent highway," is a rude column of stone, crowned with a bronze armillary sphere, decorated with dolphins and anchors, on a marble base. This is the memorial of the illustrious Magellanes, the founder of Spanish authority in these islands. The city has seventeen spacious streets, crossing each other at right angles. The Plaza, in the fortress, with the cathedral on one side and the palace on another, is a handsome square, "its centre adorned by the glorious vegetation of the tropics, whose leaves present all varieties of colour, from the brightest yellow to the deepest green, and whose flowers are remarkable for their splendour and beauty." The climate is not undesirable, the average temperature being 81° 97′ Fahrenheit. Europeans complain of the habitual dulness of the place; no skiffs diversify the river, no yachts add to the natural beauty of the bay; the sands are never enlivened by the animating horse-race, the beautiful drives are neglected. The climate may have something to do with this tendency to inaction in pleasure, the gravity of the Spanish character still more. There is a set-off against the great natural advantages of Manila and these islands in the liability to earthquakes. This has given its character to the domestic architecture that prevails, in which the light bamboo is found in the scaffolding, floors and principal wood-work, while the palm makes the walls and covers the roof. The same danger has given to the night-dresses of both sexes a more elaborate character than is found in temperate zones, that the sleeper may on the instant of alarm be prepared to fly from impending destruction.

Our author missed in this pleasant city the graceful Spanish costume, here as elsewhere Paris giving the accepted law as to dress; but he found some traces of the habits of old Spain, which he well describes:

"Among Europeans the habits of European life are slightly modified by the climate; but it appeared to me among the Spaniards there were more of the characteristics of old Spain than would now be found in the Peninsula itself. In my youth I often heard it said—and it was said with truth—that neither Don Quixote nor Gil Blas were pictures of the

past alone, but that they were faithful portraits of the Spain which I saw around me. Spain had then assuredly not been Europeanized; but fifty years—fifty years of increased and increasing intercourse with the rest of the world—have blotted out the ancient nationality, and European modes, usages and opinions, have pervaded and permeated all the upper and middling classes of Spanish society—nay, have descended deep and spread far among the people, except those of the remote and rural districts. There is little now to distinguish the aristocratical and high-bred Spaniard from his equals in other lands. In the somewhat lower grades, however, and among the whole body of clergy, the impress of the past is preserved with little change. Strangers of foreign nations, principally English and Americans, have brought with them conveniences and luxuries which have been to some extent adopted by the opulent Spaniards of Manila; and the honourable, hospitable and liberal spirit which is found among the great merchants of the East, has given them 'name and fame' among Spanish colonists and native cultivators. Generally speaking, I found a kind and generous urbanity prevailing,—friendly intercourse where that intercourse had been sought,—the lines of demarcation and separation between ranks and classes less marked and impassable than in most Oriental countries. I have seen at the same table Spaniard, mestizo and Indian—priest, civilian and soldier. No doubt a common religion forms a common bond; but to him who has observed the alienations and repulsions of *caste* in many parts of the Eastern world—caste, the great social curse—the blending and free intercourse of man with man in the Philippines is a contrast well worth admiring. M. Mallat's enthusiasm is unbounded in speaking of Manila. 'Enchanting city!' he exclaims; 'in thee are goodness, cordiality, a sweet, open, noble hospitality,—the generosity which makes our neighbour's house our own;—in thee the difference of fortune and hierarchy disappears. Unknown to thee is etiquette. O Manila! a warm heart can never forget thy inhabitants, whose memory will be eternal for those who have known them.'"—Pp. 17—19.

The statistics of Manila tell us of 11 churches, 3 convents, 363 private houses, and 88 public and other buildings. Of the population of 8618 souls, the Spaniards, native and European, are less than a fourth; there are 532 Chinese; the rest are Indians and Mestizos.

Of the calamities to which these islanders are specially subject, our author gives some striking particulars:

"Like other tropical climates, the Philippines are visited by the usual calamities gathered by the wild elements round that line which is deemed the girdle of the world. Violent hurricanes produce fearful devastations; typhoons cover the coasts with wrecks; inundations of rivers and excessive rains destroy the earth's produce, while long-continued droughts are equally fatal to the labours and the hopes of husbandry. Earthquakes shake the land, overturn the strongest edifices and sport destructively with the power of man; volcanic mountains inundate the earth with their torrents of burning lava. Clouds of locusts sometimes devour all that is green upon the surface of the ground; and epidemic diseases carry away multitudes of the human race. The ravages caused by accidental fires are often most calamitous, as the greater part

of the houses are constructed of inflammable materials. When such a disaster occurs, it spreads with wonderful rapidity, and, there being no adequate means of extinction, a whole population is often rendered houseless."—Pp. 74, 75.

"The destructive ravages and changes produced by earthquakes are nowhere more remarkable than in the Philippines. They have overturned mountains, they have filled up valleys, they have desolated extensive plains; they have opened passages for the sea into the interior, and from the lakes into the sea. There are many traditional stories of these territorial revolutions, but of late disasters the records are trustworthy. That of 1796 was sadly calamitous. In 1824 many churches in Manila were destroyed, together with the principal bridge, the barracks, great numbers of private houses; and a chasm opened of nearly four miles in length. The inhabitants all fled into the fields, and the six vessels in the port were wrecked. The number of victims was never ascertained. In 1828, during another earthquake, the vibration of the lamps was found to describe an arch of four and a half feet; the huge corner-stones of the principal gate of the city were displaced; the great bells were set ringing. It lasted between two and three minutes, rent the walls of several churches and other buildings, but was not accompanied by subterranean noises, as is usually the case."—Pp. 81, 82.

"Earthquakes have produced great changes in the geography of the Philippines. In that of 1627, one of the most elevated of the mountains of Cagayan disappeared. In 1675, in the island of Mindanao, a passage was opened to the sea, and a vast plain was emerged. Successive earthquakes have brought upon Luzon a series of calamities."—P. 82.

Sir John Bowring closes his chapter on the geography and climate of the Philippine Islands with this beautiful passage:

"One cannot but be struck, in reference to the geographical character of these islands, with the awful serenity and magnificent beauty of their primeval forests, so seldom penetrated, and in their recesses hitherto inaccessible to the foot of man. There is nothing to disturb their silence but the hum of insects, the song of birds, the noises of wild animals, the rustling of the leaves, or the fall of decayed branches. It seems as if vegetation revelled in undisturbed and uncontrolled luxuriance. Creeping plants wander from tree to tree; lovely orchids hang themselves from trunks and boughs. One asks, why is so much sweetness, so much glory, wasted? But is it wasted? To the Creator the contemplation of his works, even where unmarked by human eye, must be complacent; and these half-concealed, half-developed treasures, are but reserved storehouses for man to explore; they will furnish supplies to awaken the curiosity and gratify the inquiry of successive ages. Rove where he may—explore as he will—tax his intellect with research, his imagination with inventions—there is, there will be, an infinite field around and above him, inexhaustible through countless generations."—Pp. 85, 86.

A few extracts must be selected expository of the religious ideas of the Philippine Indians:

"Many of the padres complain that, notwithstanding all the religious instruction given, the taint of idolatry still exists among the converted Indians. There is a sort of worship of ancestors which is seen in many forms. They attach to the word *nono* (forefather) the same spiritual

meaning which the Chinese give to *Kwei*. These nonos are often addressed in prayer, in order to bring down blessings or to avert calamities. If an Indian gather a flower or fruit, he silently asks leave of the nono. Certain spots, woods and rivers, he never passes without an invocation to these departed genii. Pardon is asked for short-comings or actions of doubtful character. There is a disease called *pamoao* which is attributed to the influence of the nonos, to whom petitions and sacrifices are offered to obtain relief. These idolatries, says one of the friars, are so deeply rooted and so widely spread as to demand the utmost vigilance for their extirpation.

"So, again, they have their native devil, in the shape of a little black old man, a wild horse, or monster. As a protection against this fiend, however, they apply to their rosary, which certainly affords evidence that *he* is an orthodox demon of whom the padres cannot fairly complain."—P. 156.

"The ancient Indian name for God was *Bathala*, to whom they attributed the creation of the world. Remnants of the old idolatry remain among the people, and the names of some of the idols are preserved." P. 157.

They have a god of eating, a god of the harvest, another deity who cures diseases; fishermen and hunters have each their tutelary deity.

"Though they have a pantheon of gods and goddesses (for most of their divinities have wives), they have no temples, and no rites of public worship. They consult soothsayers (usually old women) in their diseases and difficulties; and there are sacrifices, outpouring and mingling of blood, libations of fermented liquors, violent gesticulations, and invocations to *Cambunian* (God), the moon, and the stars, and the ceremonials end with eating and drinking to excess. They sacrifice a pig to pacify the Deity when it thunders, and adore the rainbow after the storm. Before a journey they kindle a fire, and if the smoke do not blow in the direction they intend to take they delay their project. The flight of birds is watched as an important augury, and the appearance of a snake as a warning against some approaching calamity."—P. 172.

The ecclesiastical authority of these islands is vested in one archbishop and three bishops. Among the Filipinos, as among other Catholic people, religious processions prevail and are highly popular.

"The most brilliant are those which take place after sunset, when some thousands of persons carry lighted wax candles, and the procession is sometimes a mile long, composed of all the military and civil authorities and of the ecclesiastical functionaries, vying with each other in the display of their zeal and devotion. On these occasions splendidly dressed images of the various objects of veneration form an important part of the ceremonial. I was assured that the jewels worn by the image of *Nuestra Senora de la Inaculada Concepcion* on the day of her festival exceeded 25,000 dollars in value. Numerous bands of music accompany the show. One of the most interesting parts of the exhibition is the number of little girls prettily and fancifully dressed in white, who follow some of the images of the saints or the *palio* of the arch-

bishop. One of the processions witnessed was forty minutes in passing, and of immense length, the whole way being lined with bearers of wax lights on both sides. There seems a rivalry among the religious orders as to whose displays shall be the most effective and imposing. The images are of the size of life, and clad in gorgeous garments encumbered with ornaments. They are borne on the shoulders of their votaries, occupying a platform, whence they are visible to the crowd."—Pp. 202, 203.

Many individuals and ecclesiastical communities enjoy great wealth. Some of the monks have their eight or nine thousand dollars per annum. Their accumulations pass at their death to their convents. The clergy give the Indians little trouble provided they attend mass with regularity and pay liberally the accustomed fees. Of the character of the clergy Sir John writes with moderation and candour:

"The personal courtesies, the kind reception and multifarious attentions which I received from the friars in every part of the Philippines naturally dispose me to look upon them with a friendly eye. I found among them men worthy of being loved and honoured, some of considerable intellectual vigour; but literary cultivation and scientific acquirements are rare. Occupied with their own concerns, they are little acquainted with mundane affairs. Politics, geography, history, have no charms for those who, even had they the disposition for study, would, in their seclusion and remoteness, have access to few of its appliances. Their convents are almost palatial, with extensive courts, grounds and gardens; their revenues frequently enormous. Though their mode of life is generally unostentatious and simple, many of them keep handsome carriages and have the best horses in the locality; and they are surrounded generally by a prostrate and superstitious population, upon whose hopes and fears, thoughts and feelings, they exercise an influence which would seem magical were it not by their devotees deemed divine. This influence, no doubt, is greatly due to the heroism, labours, sufferings and sacrifices of the early missionaries, and to the admirably organized hierarchy of the Roman Church, whose ramifications reach to the extremest points in which any of the forms or semblances of Christianity are to be discovered. Volumes upon volumes—the folio records of the proceedings of the different religious orders, little known to Protestant readers—fill the library shelves of these Catholic establishments, which are the receptacles of their religious history."—Pp. 209, 210.

The Philippine Islands are free from the curse of slavery; yet one class of labourers, the female weavers in the island of Iloilo, by improvidence lose the liberty of carrying their labour to the market they may find the best. A Lancashire weaver on her three or four looms would scorn the pittance of the Philippine weaver.

"All the weaving is done by women, whose wages usually amount to from 1 to 1·50 dollar per month. In general—a practice unfortunately too prevalent among the natives in every branch of labour—these wages are received for many months in advance, and the operatives frequently spend years (become, in fact, virtually slaves for a long period) before

paying off an originally trifling debt. There are other workwomen employed at intervals to 'set up' the pattern in the loom, who are able to earn from 1 to 1·50 dollar per day in this manner."—P. 397.

The report which our countryman gives of the public instruction of these islands is not hopeful, the provisions for it being little in advance of those that existed in the middle ages in Europe. There is at St. Thomas an university which has about 1000 students, and the studies range through grammar, metaphysics, the law, canon and civil, and theology. For the modern languages and science no provision is made. There are colleges and convents for women, but the instruction given is of a humble character. There is a naval school and an academy of arts.

We could gladly continue our extracts from this very interesting volume, but are warned by our decreasing space to hasten to a conclusion. The details of the products and commercial wants of these fertile islands and their prosperous inhabitants will be read with care, and we hope to their advantage, by our merchants. The impression made by Sir John Bowring's visit to three of the Philippine Islands evidently is that, unlike China, the country is under-peopled and affords boundless natural resources to the emigrant. Before closing the volume, we make one more extract, an eloquent passage, in which our countryman expresses the strength of his faith in the benignity and omnipotence of God's providence in regulating the proportion of food and other means of happiness to the human race:

"In the last generation a wonderful sensation was produced by the propagation of the great Malthusian discovery—the irresistible, indisputable, inexorable truth—that the productive powers of the soil were less and less able to compete with the consuming demands of the human race; that while population was increasing with the rapidity of a swift geometrical progression, the means of providing food lagged with the feebleness of a slow arithmetical advance more and more behind; that the seats at nature's table—rich and abundant though it was—were being abundantly filled, and that there was no room for superfluous and uninvited guests; in a word, to use the adopted formula, that population was pressing more and more upon subsistence, and that the results must be increasing want, augmenting misery, and a train of calamities boundless as the catalogue of the infinite forms of mortal wretchedness.

"How often, when threading through the thousand islands of the Philippine Archipelago, did the shadow of Malthus and the visions of his philosophy present themselves to my thoughts. Of those unnumbered, sea-surrounded regions, how many there are that have never been trodden by European foot, how few that have been thoroughly explored, and fewer still that are now inhabited by any civilized or foreign race! And yet they are covered with beautiful and spontaneous vegetable riches above, and bear countless treasures of mineral wealth below; their powers of production are boundless; they have the varieties of climate which mountains, valleys and plains afford—rains to water—suns to ripen—rivers to conduct—harbours for shipment—every recommendation to attract adventure and to reward industry; a population

of only five or six millions, when ten times that number might be supplied to satiety, and enable to provide for millions upon millions more out of the superfluities of their means.

"To what a narrow field of observation must the mind have been confined that felt alarm at a discovery, in itself of so little importance, when brought into the vast sphere of the world's geography! Though the human race has been increasing at a rapid and almost immeasurable rate, it will be probably found that famines, and plagues, and wars, and those calamitous visitations which were deemed the redresses of the balance—the restorers of the due proportions between man's wants and man's supplies—were far more disastrous in ancient than in modern times, if the smaller number of then existing human beings be taken into consideration.

"The nobler and higher axiom is that 'progress' is the law of Providence, which never fails, while the race of man proceeds in ever-augmenting numbers, to provide ample means for their maintenance and happiness. Neither land nor sea is exhausted nor in process of exhaustion. What myriads of acres, whether in cold, temperate, or tropical climes, remain to be appropriated! what still greater amount to be improved by cultivation! And while in the more densely peopled parts of the world outlets may be required for those who are ill at ease and born to no inheritance but labour, how wonderfully are locomotive facilities increased, so that the embarrassment to ambulatory man is less to discover a fit place for his domicile, than to select one amid the many which offer themselves to his choice! If the poverty-struck Irish could emigrate in such multitudes to American or Australian regions, far greater are the facilities possessed by those better conditioned labouring masses of Europe who are still heavily pressed by the competition of neighbours more fortunate than themselves.

"It is a matter of surprise that the Spanish colonies should not have attracted a greater number of Spaniards to settle in them; but the national spirit of the Iberian peninsula has ceased to be ambulatory or adventurous. Spain itself is thinly peopled, and offers great resources to its satisfied peasantry. 'God,' they say, 'has given everything to Spain which He had to give. Our land is an Eden—why should we desert it?' Yet Spain, backward, inert and unenergetic, as she has proved herself to be in the rivalry of active nations, has taken her part in the proud history of human advancement. The more enterprising invaders of Gothic or Anglo-Saxon blood have frequently extirpated the indigenous races of the remote countries in which they have settled. One wave of emigration has followed another; commerce and cultivation have created a demand for, and provided a supply of, the intrusive visitors. But Spain has never furnished such numbers as to dislodge the aboriginal tribes. Her colonists have been always accompanied by large bodies of ecclesiastics, bent upon bringing 'the heathen' into the Christian fold. These missionaries have no doubt often stood between the cupidity of the conqueror and the weakness of the conquered. They have preserved, by protecting the Indian clans, and it may be doubted whether ultimately the permanent interests of man will not have been served by influences, whose beneficial consequences may remain when the most prominent evils connected with those influences may be greatly modified or wholly pass away.

. . . . . .

"My observations and my reflections, then, lead to this conclusion —that, whatever exceptional cases there may be, the great tide of advancement rolls forward in ever-growing strength;—that the course of the Divine government is

> From seeming evil still educing *good*,
> And BETTER thence again, and BETTER still,
> In infinite progression;—

that the human family, taken as a whole, is constantly improving;—that every generation is wiser and better than that which preceded it;—that the savage and least improvable races will continue to be supplanted or absorbed by those of a higher intelligence;—that the semi-civilised will only be perpetuated by contact with a greater civilization, which will raise them in the scale of humanity."—Pp. 105—109.

MR. MARTINEAU IN ANSWER TO L.'S INQUIRY.

SIR,

YOUR correspondent L. (C. R. for January, p. 19) charges me with inconsistency in saying that I could not be a member of a Unitarian church, yet sharing the ministerial office in Little Portland-Street Chapel.

By a "Unitarian church" I meant, as the drift of my argument shews, a church whose constitution bound its members to a perpetuity of Unitarian doctrine, and excluded the possibility of spontaneous change.

Before accepting our present ministerial charge,—indeed, before receiving our final call to it,—Mr. Tayler and I addressed to the representatives of the congregation a letter which I presume your correspondent must have seen in print. It contains the following passage:

"It is unnecessary for us to state, that our religious views are those of Unitarian Christianity, and that we should not shrink, on suitable occasions, from asserting them in undisguised simplicity, and exhibiting them in the light best fitted to recommend them to the reason, conscience and affections of our fellow-men. But clearly as these views express our deep and mature conviction, the result of not a few years of study and reflection, we desire to hold them with the entire freedom which seems to us essential to their proper influence over the mind, rather than in conformity with the requirements of any written creed. Such doctrinal freedom we feel to be most consonant with a religious confidence in the power of simple truth, and most in accordance with the broad principle and catholic spirit of our Presbyterian forefathers. We do not know what may be the demands of your trust-deed, or how far a person becoming your minister would be bound thereby to use unaltered your form of public prayer. Our power of accepting with perfect satisfaction to our own minds any call which you might give us, must of course be

influenced by our knowledge of such restrictions, should they exist."

In answer to this statement of our feeling, renewed in the form of direct personal inquiry, we were assured, by the deputation which brought us the subsequent invitation from the Little Portland-Street society, that the constitution of the congregation was free from restrictive conditions and in harmony with our expressed wish.

For the purposes of this explanation I have used the word "church" in L.'s sense,—to denote a single congregation; but in the sentence criticised by him it was employed in its larger extent,—to denote an entire ecclesiastical denomination.

In your own note on L.'s communication, you have attributed to me, without a qualifying word, *strong dislike of the name Unitarian;* though you "think it just" to me to glean, for the better information of your correspondent, a scrap or two of evidence that I am "a believer in the doctrine of the Divine Unity." Allow me to recall your readers to the real issue, and your statement to its just dimensions, by quoting the following passage from my "Second Letter:"

"I hope it is apparent by this time that, in protesting against the ecclesiastical assumption of a dogmatic name, I am influenced by no depreciating estimate of doctrinal theology in general, or of Unitarian principles in particular. The question is not about the importance of this or that discriminative doctrine; but about the propriety of fixing *any* polemically-selected doctrine as the permanent essence of church-life. Were every characteristic of my own theology,—all that I most distinctly and positively hold,—picked out, endowed with some adequately expressive name, and put into the same position, my protest would lose nothing of its earnestness. *As for the word 'Unitarian,' it is a good one,* when you want to mark the particular side of theology to which it refers, and to speak of people by their theological classification. So long as the idea of a saving orthodoxy regulates the language of Christendom, and fixes curiosity more upon the creed than upon the life of men, the world will perhaps describe us by this name or by that of 'Socinian.' But it belongs to our ecclesiastical protest against the whole notion of orthodoxy, to accept neither; to insist on deposing the differences of creed from their monstrous usurpation; to draw forth into just prominence the spiritual and moral conditions in which alone our relation to God is realized; and in the name of Christ to proclaim a church of goodness, love, and heavenly-mindedness."

London, Jan. 18, 1860. JAMES MARTINEAU.

POSTSCRIPT BY THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

We regret to find that the Postscript which we appended to the letter of our correspondent L. has displeased Mr. Martineau. Knowing

as we did that that letter was written and sent to us before the writer of it had seen Mr. Martineau's Second Letter, we hoped to save the necessity of a reply by giving some of the evidence for which L. anxiously asked. When Mr. Martineau states that we have attributed to him, "without a qualifying word, *strong dislike of the name Unitarian*," he is not quite accurate. As there *is* the qualifying word, of the absence of which Mr. Martineau complains, we suppose that in penning his criticism he had not the *Christian Reformer* before him, and so unintentionally misrepresented us. Our words, which he does not quote, were (p. 20), "We think it just to Mr. Martineau to quote one or two passages which intimate that he is a believer in the doctrine of the Divine Unity, however strongly he dislikes the name 'Unitarian,' and whatever may be his estimate of Unitarian literature, plans of organization," &c. &c. We then selected as many passages as suited our available space on the page and seemed to answer the questions put by L. We are well pleased that to these passages the addition of another is made by its author.

But perhaps the most important part of Mr. Martineau's present communication is the passage given from the joint letter of himself and Mr. Tayler to the Portland-Street congregation. We suppose we are right in regarding it as the expression of Mr. Martineau's present theological convictions; and although we cannot reconcile the statement with some passages in his first Letter, and still less put it into harmony with the ungenial and antagonistic spirit which pervaded it, we are pleased to receive an explicit statement like this, which will dissipate much misunderstanding among Unitarians and others. The painful part of the case is, that it is impossible for this last letter of Mr. Martineau to enjoy the wide circulation given to the first Letter, and for years probably we shall have the sharp and *apparently* anti-Unitarian passages of the latter thrown in our teeth by theological opponents. Already this use has been made of it by Mr. Rowland Williams on the one side and by Mr. Holyoake on the other.

Here we are content to let the "Position" controversy drop. A strong conviction of the inexpediency of its continuance restrained us in our notice of the Second Letter. The same motive induces us to take only a passing notice of the speech lately delivered by Mr. Martineau at Liverpool, in which he gives an account, more clever than dignified and more amusing than fair, of the objections of his critics. We content ourselves with the remark that we do not accept his statement of the argument between himself and us as accurate. With this reference to the controversial portion of the Liverpool speech, we let it pass, wishing only to retain in our memory the beautiful thoughts and golden truths which, mixed with some alloy, abound in it.

DEFERENCE TO CUSTOM.

He who does anything because it is the custom, makes no choice. He gains no practice either in discerning or in desiring what is best. *Mill on Liberty.*

INTELLIGENCE.

MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE, LONDON.

The annual meeting of the Trustees, the seventy-fourth, was held in the chapel-rooms, Cross Street, Manchester, on Thursday, the 19th of January. There was a numerous attendance of Trustees, occasioned in great part by a statement which had crept into the newspapers, to the effect that there existed an intention to attack the position of Mr. Martineau as one of the Professors, on the ground of dissatisfaction with his theological views. Although this unfounded rumour received immediate and official contradiction, it was injudiciously renewed in an article, in other respects not commendable, by the editor of the *Inquirer*, in the publication immediately preceding the day of meeting. There were between sixty and seventy Trustees present from London, Leeds, Lancaster, Bolton, Sheffield, as well as Manchester and the immediate vicinity.

Neither President nor Vice-President being in attendance at the commencement of the proceedings, Rev. W. GASKELL was called to the chair, and remarked that he believed the College was never in a more prosperous condition financially than at present, or, if its friends would agree to unite their differences, in a better position to fulfil satisfactorily the objects for which it was founded. Having read a letter from Mr. W. R. Wood, explaining the reasons of his absence from the meeting, he called on Mr. R. D. Darbishire, one of the Secretaries, to read the minutes of the proceedings of the Committee for the past year.

This having been done, Mr. J. C. LAWRENCE, in moving that the minutes be confirmed, took occasion to advert to two points; one, which he had already brought before the notice of the Trustees at meetings in London, was the promotion among their students of the habit of expressing themselves in public without the use of notes. He was afraid that in this respect Manchester New College students compared unfavourably with those of other denominations; and believing that their Professors were quite prepared to follow out any suggestions of the Committee, with whom he thought the initiative should lie, he begged to inquire whether any steps were being taken to ensure greater attention to this matter. The other point referred to the subjects of study. He believed that Political Economy had been mentioned as part of the Philosophical course, and feeling strongly the importance of this subject, begged to inquire whether its introduction into the curriculum was being provided for by the Committee.

Rev. C. BEARD explained that, although Political Economy had been originally mentioned as part of Mr. Martineau's course, complaints had been so frequently made of the subjects of study being already too numerous and the students' attention too severely taxed, that the Committee had not been able to see their way clearly to a further increase of work.

The CHAIRMAN, with respect to the subject of extempore speaking, explained that the Principal had by no means lost sight of it, but took much pains himself to practise the students in ready utterance, and was pursuing a plan which had been recommended to him by Mr. Macready, whom he had consulted.

Mr. GEORGE WADSWORTH, judging from the utterance of a recent student of the College, the newly-elected minister of Cross Street, was led to infer that the faculty of ready address had been very successfully attended to.

The resolution for confirming the minutes, having been seconded by Mr. S. D. DARBISHIRE, was then put and carried unanimously.

The next business was the reading of the Treasurer's report, from which it appeared that the excess of receipts over expenditure, after transferring £200 to the Permanent Fund, amounted to about £90, of which, however, £50 will be absorbed by a necessary increase of shelving in the Library. The subscriptions actually collected amounted to £1166; benefactions, including £100 each from the Principal (for Hebrew instruction) and the late President, Mr. J. P. Heywood, to £265; congregational collections, including £75 from Brook Street, Manchester, and £58 from Renshaw Street, Liverpool, to £208; rents of buildings, £547, and farms, £243; interest, £265; total receipts, £2695; while the total disbursements, including £200 transferred to Permanent Fund, amounted to £2604. The capital stock of the Institution, including a balance in hand of £786, was estimated at £19,697.

The Treasurer's report having been passed, the Secretary, Mr. R. D. Darbishire, read the address of the Committee:

"The Committee of Manchester New College, in presenting their annual report to the Trustees, desire, in the first place, to state, in explanation of the accounts, that they have received from congregational

collections during the past year the sum of £208. 11*s.*, a large part of which was acknowledged in the last annual address. They have also received in benefactions the sum of £265. 1*s.*, including a gift from the President of £100, and another of like amount from the Principal.

"The subscriptions discontinued and unpaid during the year amount to about £30, and the same sum has been added in new or increased ones. The list of 1859, as compared with that of 1858, shews a deficiency of about £40, which arises from the deaths of several old and liberal friends.

"Of the balance of £290 exhibited by the accounts to the credit of the Institution, £200 has been transferred to Permanent Fund, and a portion of the remainder will be devoted to the purchase of additional bookcases for the library.

"The Committee regret to state that they have received from Mr. R. N. Philips his resignation of the Treasurership of the College, an office which he had held since the year 1854. They think it due to the energy and efficiency with which Mr. Philips has performed his duties, to repeat in this place the thanks which they have already offered to him by resolution.

"During the past year, the Committee have had to deplore the loss by death of the Rev. James Whitehead, a Trustee since 1839; of the Rev. Charles Wallace, M.A., a Trustee since 1821, and formerly a student of Manchester College, York; and of the Rev. William Harrison, a Trustee since 1806. The death of Mr. John Ashton Nicholls, F.R.A.S., of Manchester, a gentleman whose philanthropic enterprize and public usefulness had already earned for him the respect of all his fellow-citizens, is a subject of peculiar regret to those who would willingly attribute to the influences that affected him while a lay student in Manchester New College, somewhat of the enlightened and self-sacrificing energy that characterized him.

"The decease of the Rev. William Turner, a Trustee since 1805, a subscriber since 1807, and Visitor of the College for more than 50 years, demands an especial mention in this place. The Committee have already expressed their deep sense of Mr. Turner's long and efficient services to the College, in a resolution which they placed upon their minutes and transmitted to his surviving relatives. But they cannot allow the present occasion to pass without again putting on record their respectful admiration of Mr. Turner's honourable and blameless life, of the devotion of his energies, during more than man's ordinary term of efficiency, to none but useful and benevolent objects, and of the wise counsels which he gave to so many generations of departing students.

"During the session of 1858-59, the number of divinity students on the foundation was sixteen, viz., sixth year, Messrs. C. B. Upton, B.A., James Drummond, B.A., and John Lloyd; fifth year, Messrs. Joseph Dare, B.A., Percy Bakewell, B.A., George Heaviside, B.A., and R. W. Simpson, B.A.; fourth year, Mr. Frederick Mitchell; third year, Messrs. E. S. Howse, B.A., James Pillars, J. D. H. Smyth, and H. E. Dowson; second year, Mr. W. J. Smyth; first year, Mr. T. H. Smith. Besides these, Mr. Wm. Matthews, sixth year, and Mr. W. C. Coupland, B.A., fourth year, were admitted free to lectures; Mr. Matthews also receiving a special grant of £25 for the year.

"With the approval of the Committee, Mr. Joseph Dare was permitted to hold a scholarship granted by the Fishmongers' Company of London, for the purpose of enabling him to attend additional courses at University College. Mr. Upton, Mr. Drummond, Mr. Lloyd and Mr. Matthews, have completed their academical studies. Mr. Drummond has accepted an invitation to become the colleague of the Rev. Wm. Gaskell in the ministry at Cross-Street chapel, Manchester. Mr. Lloyd has succeeded the late Rev. John Smethurst at Moreton Hampstead; and Mr. Matthews, the Rev. J. K. Montgomery at Huddersfield. Mr. Upton is pursuing his studies as a Hibbert scholar. Mr. T. Holland, who left the College in June, 1858, has become the minister of the congregation at Bridgewater. Besides the regular students of the College, a few gentlemen, not otherwise connected with it, have attended some of Professor Martineau's courses.

"The Committee have taken some pains, by a more extended advertisement than had obtained in former years, to bring the College courses before the public notice, and hope, by degrees, to induce others than those who design to make the ministry their business in life, to avail themselves of the opportunities offered by lectures on such subjects as Christian Truths and Evidences, Ecclesiastical History, or Scriptural Criticism, in the hands of the Rev. John James Tayler, or by the Philosophical Courses of Rev. James Martineau, or the History of Christian Doctrines of the same Professor.

"The annual examination was held in University Hall on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday, June the 20th, 21st and 22nd. At the close of the proceedings the usual address to the students was delivered by the Rev. John Kenrick, M.A., Visitor.

"The Committee make the following

extract from the careful report of the examination presented by the Visitors, Mr. Kenrick and Mr. Gaskell:

"'In last year's report attention was drawn to the importance of the exercise afforded in grammatical analysis by readings in Greek and Latin with the Professors, and to the need there was for it. We are happy to be able to state that in this part of the examination a marked improvement was observable on that of the preceding year.

"'The answering of the students in Mathematics showed that they had made fair use of the advantages provided for them in University College and Mr. Bridge's private instruction.

"'With reference to the classes of the Principal, the answers in all of them were excellent, with the exception of those of the junior Ecclesiastical History, which seemed to us scarcely so good as we have known them in previous years. We may single out for special praise the class on New-Testament Greek, to which great care had evidently been given.

"'In Mr Martineau's department, the answers of the class in Mental Philosophy, which have generally been of great merit, struck us as somewhat below the average of former examinations; but those of the other classes were good throughout; and some of the papers read, particularly those of Mr Drummond, were remarkably full and accurate.

"'In the classes on Hebrew, the reading showed that the students were profiting by the accurate knowledge of their teacher. The questions on the introductions to the several books studied were answered in a satisfactory manner.

"'The sermons read in the Common Hall were good in tone and spirit, and the manner in which they were delivered was such as to draw forth the approval of some of the Trustees, who in this respect had found reason for complaint on previous occasions.'

"In the examinations of the London University, Mr. Edwin Smith has obtained the degree of M.A. in Mental and Moral Philosophy; and Mr. T. H. Smith and Mr. W. J. Smyth have matriculated during the past year.

"Mr. Dare and Mr. Coupland have been elected Hibbert scholars, and Mr. E. Smith has received from the same foundation an increased exhibition, with the title of Hibbert Fellow. Mr. Smith is pursuing his studies at a German University.

"In the classes of University College, the following distinctions were gained by students of Manchester New College: Mr. E. S. Howse (third year), senior Latin, third certificate; Mr. H. R. Dowson (second year), senior Latin, fourth certificate; Mr. T. H. Smith (first year), junior Latin, second prize and second certificate; Mr. E. S. Howse, senior Greek, sixth certificate; Mr. H. R. Dowson, senior Greek, ninth certificate; Natural Philosophy (junior Mathematical section), Mr. H. R. Dowson, third prize and third certificate; Mr. T. H. Smith, lower junior Mathematics, first prize and first certificate; Mr. Joseph Dare (fifth year), English essay (subject, "The Inductive Method of Bacon"), prize.

"The session of 1859-60 opened with the following divinity students, namely, Mr. W. C. Coupland, B.A., free to lectures; and, on the foundation, Messrs. Joseph Dare, B.A., George Heaviside, B.A., Percy Bakewell, B.A., R. W. Simpson, B.A., F. Mitchell, Edward S. Howse, B.A., J. D. H. Smyth, B.A., James Pillars, W. J. Smyth, T. H. Smith. Of these, Mr. Pillars has received permission to suspend his studies for the present session on account of serious ill health; and Mr. H. R. Dowson, who entered the College in his second year, has been allowed to repeat his third year's courses. The new students of the year are, Messrs. Alexander Gordon, B.A., J. R. Odgers, Richard Pilcher and John Smith.

"The Committee cannot close their address without again calling the attention of the Trustees, and, if haply they may reach them, others who share with the more accustomed friends of Manchester New College some lively interest in the religious progress of the age, to the peculiar advantages of this College as a school above all others in the country, fitted for the training of ministers qualified to take a prominent place amongst the faithful apostles of the church of God.

"At a time when on every hand earnest men are shewing themselves ready to hail with joy every word of life that reaches their ears, it would seem especially incumbent on those who have already attained a conviction of the value of the fundamental truths and influences of the religion of Christ, under whatever forms it may be held by devout men free from the restraints of sect, to stand forth and prove themselves, in the living simplicity of their own faith, honest and self-denying missionaries of God's truth.

"The Committee do but echo the sense of all thoughtful students of the time when they refer to the increasing body of persons who are prepared to recognise the unflinching exercise of the powers of thought, aided by the resources of the many-sided science of the day, the sound

stitious fetters
authority, and
more intelligent
ritual life than

he case to say,
there has not
ny or in France,
of the individual
eligion has been
ed, and so widely
ailed as now;
r in this country
en free and faith-
d might so surely
ative hearing and

e spiritual culture
rge a portion it is
f the coming gene-
of Manchester New
usly exhort all who
ncourage young men
ng themselves with
n to the work of the
reparing themselves
rty loving faith and
, in looking forward
interested self-aban-
at cause,—dwelling
st teaching others to
God."

NG, in moving the
of the address, toge-
r's report, said that
reached as complete
ally attainable. He
t the College did not
y of our body. But
diversities allowed
eat, that it was per-
ee upon any common
thing therefore was
in our Professorial
us in that love of
or freedom which we
ith these moral qua-
mind, so as to com-
their students and
l in their work.
seconded the resolu-
ed unanimously.

DS, with a few appro-
d, and Mr. ROBERT
a vote of thanks to
mittee for their ser-

Rev. F. BAKER, se-
SHTON, Mr. Thomas
or, was unanimously
the room of Mr. J. P.
etired.
ts, Chairman of Com-
were re-elected.

In the Committee, the following gentlemen were the new appointments—Messrs. Cookson and Case, of London; Mr. Thos. Avison, of Liverpool; and Mr. Henry Turner, of Manchester.

Mr. R. N. Philips having retired from the office of Treasurer, which he had held for five years to the great advantage of the Institution, Mr. Thomas Ashton was unanimously chosen thereto, on the motion of Mr. H. COPPOCK, seconded by Rev. J. H. THOM.

The routine business having been concluded, the Chairman invited any Trustees present who might wish to bring other subjects before the meeting to do so; upon which,

Mr. W. SHANN, adverting to the difficulty felt by the London members of the Committee in attending to their duties, and the expenditure of time and money involved in a journey to Manchester, suggested that one Committee meeting at least during the year should be held in London, which might easily be done in June, at the time of the examination.

Mr. HODGSON PRATT had been desirous of moving a resolution of similar purport, though carrying the idea somewhat further. He thought there should be a London Secretary appointed, to give information to those who, not belonging to our denomination, might nevertheless wish to attend some of the lectures; and he urged a more extended system of advertising, that the existence of our College may be made known to the public of other denominations.

A conversation on the practicability of these suggestions took place, in which several other gentlemen took part, and these resolutions were adopted:

"That the Trustees request the Committee to consider the propriety of their arranging to meet once in the year at least in London, and if practicable to do so.

"That it be referred to the Committee to consider whether, for the purpose of rendering the lectures at the College more easily accessible to lay students and more generally known, it be not desirable that a Secretary be appointed in London, whose business it shall be to receive the fees and afford such information in relation to the College courses and other points as may be necessary, and that the London Secretary shall act under the instructions of the Secretaries in Manchester."

The business concluded with a vote of thanks to the Chairman.

The resignation of the Treasurership and of his seat on the Committee by Mr. R. N. *Philips, lately M.P.* for Bury, and *previously High* Sheriff of Lancashire, involves,

extract from the careful report of the examination presented by the Visitors, Mr. Kenrick and Mr. Gaskell:

"'In last year's report attention was drawn to the importance of the exercise afforded in grammatical analysis by readings in Greek and Latin with the Professors, and to the need there was for it. We are happy to be able to state that in this part of the examination a marked improvement was observable on that of the preceding year.

"'The answering of the students in Mathematics shewed that they had made fair use of the advantages provided for them in University College and Mr. Bridge's private instruction.

"'With reference to the classes of the Principal, the answers in all of them were excellent, with the exception of those of the junior Ecclesiastical History, which seemed to us scarcely so good as we have known them in previous years. We may single out for special praise the class on New-Testament Greek, to which great care had evidently been given.

"'In Mr. Martineau's department, the answers of the class in Mental Philosophy, which have generally been of great merit, struck us as somewhat below the average of former examinations; but those of the other classes were good throughout; and some of the papers read, particularly those of Mr. Drummond, were remarkably full and accurate.

"'In the classes on Hebrew, the reading shewed that the students were profiting by the accurate knowledge of their teacher. The questions on the introductions to the several books studied were answered in a satisfactory manner.

"'The sermons read in the Common Hall were good in tone and spirit, and the manner in which they were delivered was such as to draw forth the approval of some of the Trustees, who in this respect had found reason for complaint on previous occasions.'

"In the examinations of the London University, Mr. Edwin Smith has obtained the degree of M.A. in Mental and Moral Philosophy; and Mr. T. H. Smith and Mr. W. J. Smyth have matriculated during the past year.

"Mr. Dare and Mr. Coupland have been elected Hibbert scholars, and Mr. E. Smith has received from the same foundation an increased exhibition, with the title of Hibbert Fellow. Mr. Smith is pursuing his studies at a German University.

"In the classes of University College, the following distinctions were gained by students of Manchester New College: Mr. E. S. Howse (third year), senior Latin, third certificate; Mr. H. E. Dowson (second year), senior Latin, fourth certificate; Mr. T. H. Smith (first year), junior Latin, second prize and second certificate; Mr. E. S. Howse, senior Greek, sixth certificate; Mr. H. E. Dowson, senior Greek, ninth certificate; Natural Philosophy (junior Mathematical section), Mr. H. E. Dowson, third prize and third certificate; Mr. T. H. Smith, lower junior Mathematics, first prize and first certificate; Mr. Joseph Dare (fifth year), English essay (subject, "The Inductive Method of Bacon"), prize.

"The session of 1859-60 opened with the following divinity students, namely, Mr. W. C. Coupland, B.A., free to lectures; and, on the foundation, Messrs. Joseph Dare, B.A., George Heaviside, B.A., Percy Bakewell, B.A., R. W. Simpson, B.A., F. Mitchell, Edward S. Howse, B.A., J. D. H. Smyth, B.A., James Pillars, W. J. Smyth, T. H. Smith. Of these, Mr. Pillars has received permission to suspend his studies for the present session on account of serious ill health; and Mr. H. E. Dowson, who entered the College in his second year, has been allowed to repeat his third year's courses. The new students of the year are, Messrs. Alexander Gordon, B.A., J. E. Odgers, Richard Pilcher and John Smith.

"The Committee cannot close their address without again calling the attention of the Trustees, and, if haply they may reach them, others who share with the more accustomed friends of Manchester New College some lively interest in the religious progress of the age, to the peculiar advantages of this College as a school, above all others in the country, fitted for the training of ministers qualified to take a prominent place amongst the faithful apostles of the church of God.

"At a time when on every hand earnest men are shewing themselves ready to hail with joy every word of life that reaches their ears, it would seem especially incumbent on those who have already attained a conviction of the value of the fundamental truths and influences of the religion of Christ, under whatever forms it may be held by devout men free from the restraints of sect, to stand forth and prove themselves, in the living simplicity of their own faith, honest and self-denying missionaries of God's truth.

"The Committee do but echo the sense of all thoughtful students of the times, when they refer to the increasing body of persons who are prepared to recognize in unflinching exercise of the powers of thought, aided by the resources of the many-sided science of the day, the soundest

means of clearing away superstitious fetters of priestcraft and church authority, and so leaving clear scope for a more intelligent development of genuine spiritual life than the world has yet seen.

"It is not overstating the case to say, that since the Reformation there has not been in England, in Germany or in France, any period when the right of the individual conscience in matters of religion has been at once so fervently asserted, and so widely allowed, or so fiercely assailed as now; nor was there ever, either in this country or in America, a time when free and faithful preachers of the word might so surely rely upon securing attentive hearing and serious consideration.

"As Trustees for the spiritual culture of one portion—how large a portion it is not for them to say—of the coming generation, the managers of Manchester New College would strenuously exhort all who have opportunity, to encourage young men of promise in applying themselves with Christian self-devotion to the work of the ministry, and after preparing themselves for a season with hearty loving faith and cultivated intelligence, in looking forward with joy to lives of disinterested self-abandonment in the great cause,—dwelling themselves, and so best teaching others to dwell, with Christ in God."

Rev. T. E. Poynting, in moving the adoption and printing of the address, together with the Treasurer's report, said that we had now perhaps reached as complete a unity as was practically attainable. He had heard it said that the College did not represent the theology of our body. But the fact was that the diversities allowed among us were so great, that it was perhaps impossible to agree upon any common theology. The only thing therefore was for us to have men in our Professorial chairs who represent us in that love of truth and reverence for freedom which we all feel, and combine with these moral qualities great powers of mind, so as to command the respect of their students and inspire them with zeal in their work.

Rev. Noah Jones seconded the resolution, which was carried unanimously.

Rev. John Robberds, with a few appropriate remarks, moved, and Mr. Robert Heywood seconded, a vote of thanks to the officers and Committee for their services.

On the motion of Rev. F. Baker, seconded by Rev. J. Ashton, Mr. Thomas Ainsworth, of Cleator, was unanimously chosen President, in the room of Mr. J. P. Heywood, who had retired.

The Vice-Presidents, Chairman of Committee and Secretaries, were re-elected.

In the Committee, the following gentlemen were the new appointments—Messrs. Cookson and Case, of London; Mr. Thos. Avison, of Liverpool; and Mr. Henry Turner, of Manchester.

Mr. R. N. Philips having retired from the office of Treasurer, which he had held for five years to the great advantage of the Institution, Mr. Thomas Ashton was unanimously chosen thereto, on the motion of Mr. H. Coppock, seconded by Rev. J. H. Thom.

The routine business having been concluded, the Chairman invited any Trustees present who might wish to bring other subjects before the meeting to do so; upon which,

Mr. W. Shaen, adverting to the difficulty felt by the London members of the Committee in attending to their duties, and the expenditure of time and money involved in a journey to Manchester, suggested that one Committee meeting at least during the year should be held in London, which might easily be done in June, at the time of the examination.

Mr. Hodgson Pratt had been desirous of moving a resolution of similar purport, though carrying the idea somewhat further. He thought there should be a London Secretary appointed, to give information to those who, not belonging to our denomination, might nevertheless wish to attend some of the lectures; and he urged a more extended system of advertising, that the existence of our College may be made known to the public of other denominations.

A conversation on the practicability of these suggestions took place, in which several other gentlemen took part, and these resolutions were adopted:

"That the Trustees request the Committee to consider the propriety of their arranging to meet once in the year at least in London, and if practicable to do so.

"That it be referred to the Committee to consider whether, for the purpose of rendering the lectures at the College more easily accessible to lay students and more generally known, it be not desirable that a Secretary be appointed in London, whose business it shall be to receive the fees and afford such information in relation to the College courses and other points as may be necessary, and that the London Secretary shall act under the instructions of the Secretaries in Manchester."

The business concluded with a vote of thanks to the Chairman.

The resignation of the Treasurership and of his seat on the Committee by Mr. R. N. Philips, lately M.P. for Bury, and previously High Sheriff of Lancashire, involves

we fear, the separation from College affairs of that which we may term the great Dissenting family of Philips. To the accumulated property of the College, that family has been in its various branches by far the largest contributor. From the day of the foundation of Manchester College, on the 22nd of February, 1786, to the meeting a few days ago, there has never been a time when one or more members of that family have not been active and prominent members of the College Committee, and taking a leading part in everything connected with the welfare and usefulness of the Institution. Indeed, in the late Mr. Robert Philips and his two sons there has been an uninterrupted succession of service on the Committee during the whole period of seventy-two years of the existence of Manchester College. The interest, so long and steadily maintained, has, we know, continued unabated to the last. Of the causes which have now led to the withdrawal of Mr. R. N. Philips from the position which he filled honourably alike to himself and to the religious body to which he belonged, we have no definite information. Whatever may have been the cause of Mr. Philips's retirement from office, the fact must be sincerely deplored by every one who desires the prosperity and usefulness of the College.

RECOGNITION SERVICE AT HUDDERSFIELD.

The recognition services in connection with the settlement of Rev. W. Matthews, late student of Manchester New College, London, as minister of Fitzwilliam-Street Church, Huddersfield, took place on Wednesday, December 28th, 1859.

Divine service commenced at eleven o'clock. After an introductory hymn, the Rev. John Owen, of Lydgate, read the appropriate lessons from Ezekiel xxxiii. and 2 Timothy ii., and offered the ordination prayer. Mr. William Hornblower, in behalf of the congregation, then briefly addressed the newly-elected minister in words which indicated a deep sense of the solemnity of the relation of a Christian minister to his people. Mr. Matthews's reply partook of the same spirit; and on the part of both, the mutual relation now recognized and confirmed was viewed in the light of a just and confiding liberty. The welcome of the West-Riding ministers to Mr. Matthews was then given by Rev. J. H. Ryland, of Bradford, who, after adverting to the issue of religious liberty in Christian truth, in the case of confessors and ministers in Yorkshire and the north, both of former and more recent times, and indicating some of the peculiar dangers to the ministerial office incident to the present time, welcomed Mr. Matthews to the district as one who had passed through the ordeal of a change of view, was of the same *alma mater* with many whom he now joined, and would, they felt assured, prove a congenial and devoted fellow-labourer; while of all present it would be the fervent prayer that, as he entered into the labours of those who before him had faithfully and zealously laboured to build up both the inward and the outward church in Huddersfield, his labours and anxieties equally with theirs might be crowned with a permanent and abiding success. After a suitable hymn, the charge was given by Rev. J. J. Tayler, B.A., Principal of Manchester New College. His subject was "preaching Christ" as himself the revelation of the Father; preaching him also by the assiduous cultivation of his spirit of self-sacrificing devotion. After another hymn, the sermon was preached by the Rev. G. Vance Smith, B.A., of York, from Matt. vii. 28, 29. It took a most just and discriminating view of the reciprocal duties of minister and people at the present time; its considerate Christian counsel at once commending itself to the hearer. An anthem and hymn followed, after which Mr. Smith concluded the service with the usual prayer.

At the close of service, members of the congregation and friends assembled to dinner at the Imperial Hotel, W. P. England, Esq., Secretary of Committee, in the chair. The principal speakers after dinner were Rev. B. Herford, of Sheffield, and Revds. J. J. Tayler and G. V. Smith. Mr. Herford applied the sentiment of Civil and Religious Liberty to the immediate and pressing claims of Unitarian Christianity. Mr. Tayler pleaded for the inviolateness of daily hours of study on the part of the young minister. Mr. Smith returned thanks in acknowledgment of the health of the gentlemen who had taken part in the service, and in doing so made pleasing allusion to Rev. G. Heape Stanley, the first minister of the Huddersfield congregation, now of Sydney, Australia. Joseph Lupton, Esq., of Leeds, acknowledged the health of the visitors.

In the evening, there was a congregational tea-party in the school-rooms beneath the chapel, Mr. England again in the chair. The rooms were brightly decorated. Mr. Herford and Rev. G. Barmby, of Wakefield, were obliged to leave early in the afternoon, Mr. Owen and Rev. R. L. Carpenter, of Halifax, in the course of the evening; the latter, however, not before he had taken a part allotted to him. Mr. T. H. Smith, student of Manchester New

College, and Mr. Mark Glover, were present during the day, from Bradford. Mr. G. Buckton accompanied Mr. J. Lupton from Leeds. Mr. H. J. Morehouse was present also from Stony Bank, Lydgate. In the course of the afternoon and evening's proceedings, letters were read from Revds. J. Kenrick, of York, T. Hincks, of Leeds, J. Martineau, Dr. Beard, R. Kell, and Mr. James Robinson, of Clayton West, explaining causes of absence. Mr. Kell's letter alluded to the Huddersfield congregational history, and the great obligations of the society to its former ministers. Mr. Hincks had been suddenly called to Belfast by the death of a sister.

After tea, the speakers and sentiments were as follow:

Mr. WHITTAKER—"The necessity of Individual Effort to preserve Congregational Life."

Mr. HORNBLOWER—"May our Sunday-schools be a nursery for our Church, and our Church a foster-mother to our Sunday-schools!"

Rev. R. L. CARPENTER, Secretary to the West-Riding Missionary Society—"The Working-classes of our country; may they find shelter in our free churches, and response to their religious yearnings; and may God's continued blessing rest upon the West-Riding of Yorkshire!" Mr. Carpenter alluded to the zeal of his predecessor, Rev. J. K. Montgomery, in the office of Secretary, and gave a sketch of the success of the present missionary stations.

Rev. P. CANNON, of Wakefield, also gave an account of the formation of the Dewsbury Unitarian society.

Rev. J. J. TAYLER—"Catholicity of sentiment, and sympathy with the good and great of other churches, compatible with the manly avowal and zealous diffusion of Unitarian Christianity." Mr. Tayler's was a beautiful address, full of most true and just distinction.

Rev. G. VANCE SMITH—"Unitarian interpretations of Scripture not the errors of an uninformed minority, but the conclusions endorsed by the foremost theologians of the age." Mr. Smith took just exception to the word "*Unitarian* interpretations," pointing out that the only aim of an interpreter of scripture was to learn what scripture means, be it this or that. Mr. Smith also pointed out the special inconsistency of the party loudest for inspiration, loudest also for no change in an imperfect text and inadequate translation.

Mr. W. FROANE—"The old Pulpit in its new place, [it had been changed from one side of the chapel to the other]; may all the good wishes of our friends and visitors this day be abundantly realised in the success and happiness of the Rev. W. Matthews in this his first sphere of ministerial labour!"

Rev. W. MATTHEWS responded, dwelling upon the liberty he experienced among Unitarians as compared with his former sphere of life, expressing his desire for numbers without their pale to join, and urging his new flock to congregational activity.

Rev. J. H. RYLAND, in speaking to the sentiment of "The Fathers of liberal Nonconformity and the influence of their examples," alluded not only to the dangers of fashion to open avowal, but also to the now common case of sentiment without conviction adding to the danger.

The usual acknowledgments concluded the evening, which had also been varied with music from the choir.

A NOBLE PHILANTHROPIC EFFORT IN BIRMINGHAM.

A friend has sent us a pamphlet which we have looked through with no little interest. It is entitled, "Report of Collections for the Benefit of the General Hospital, Birmingham, in the Churches and Chapels of the Town and Neighbourhood, made simultaneously on Sunday, Nov. 13, 1859; and of the Proceedings connected therewith." The General Hospital of Birmingham was established in 1766 by Dr. John Ash, an eminent physician, and opened in 1778 with 40 beds. It has grown with the wonderful growth of the town, and now contains 240 beds for in-door patients and has a separate out-patient department. In the year ending at Midsummer last, it gave relief to more than 19,000 patients. Since the erection of the Hospital, the number of patients admitted to its benefits amounts to nearly half a million! Its affairs are conducted with skill and economy. The cost of each in-patient averages £3. 9*s.* 10*d.*; that of each out-patient, 1*s.* 10*d.* The crowded state of the Hospital last year gave importance to the suggestion that another wing should be built; but before engaging in new and increased expenditure, it was necessary to remove a debt due to the Treasurers of £3500. Dr. Miller, the benevolent and respected rector of St. Martin's, appealed in a letter (published in the *Birmingham Journal*, and bearing date Oct. 13, 1859) to the generosity of his townsmen to clear off the debt, and suggested that a collection should be made from pew to pew in every place of worship in the town on some given Sunday. A conference of the ministers of religion was invited by circular before the end of the month, in order to take steps

for carrying Dr. Miller's suggestion into effect. We observe with pride that the name of our respected correspondent, Rev. SAMUEL BACHE, is the first signature attached to the circular. All classes of ministers of religion, Protestant and Catholic, Churchmen and Dissenters, joined the meeting; and as its result, the second Sunday in November was fixed upon as the day for the combined charitable movement of the religious public of Birmingham. On that day more than 140 collections were made in the churches and chapels of Birmingham and of some of the neighbouring towns, and the noble sum was raised of £5051. The members of the two Unitarian congregations did their duty on this occasion, and stand second and third in the list, the order being regulated by the amount of the contribution. The New Meeting-house sent £319. 3*s.*, and the Old Meeting-house £203. 18*s.* 6*d.* The place of honour is given to Dr. Miller's church, St. Martin's, which contributed £407. 19*s.* 10*d.* Dr. Miller had anticipated that seven congregations would send each £100. In fact, ten sent upwards of £150, and fifteen sent more than £100 each.

A deputation of the ministers of religion reported to a special weekly Board of the Hospital the results of the appeal. Dr. Miller concluded his speech on the occasion by remarking "that the printed record of the movement which was being prepared would be a memorial of the fact, that in our day there was, in the hearts of the people of Birmingham, a well-spring of philanthropy and benevolence which was ready to well up if rightly appealed to, and that they acted according to the golden sentence dropped from the lips of one whom they had recently lost, 'As there is no sectarianism in misery, there should be no sectarianism in mercy.'"

A resolution of gratitude was tendered to the ministers of religion, which Mr. Bache acknowledged, "thanking the Committee for their efforts, and bore hearty testimony to the debt of gratitude they owed to Dr. Miller for the courtesy and urbanity with which he had presided at their meetings. It was probably unprecedented that 50 or 60 clergymen and ministers should have met on two occasions without utterance being given to a single word that any one would wish to have recalled. He hoped all would do their best that the divine blessing which had been bestowed on that movement might not be frittered away or lost, but that it would stimulate them in the cause of general benevolence, and in cherishing that spirit of mutual love which became those professing to be ministers of the God of love."

We may add that the Cradley Unitarian congregation contributed £12. 8*s.* 6*d.*; that of Dudley, £22. 12*s.* 4*d.*; that of Stourbridge, £23. 2*s.*; and the Newhall-Hill congregation (Birmingham), £16. 14*s.* 7*d.* And the "widow's mite" was contributed by the Domestic Mission. Well is it observed in relation to this movement of philanthropy so judiciously conceived and so nobly extended, "Never has an Ecclesiastical Council been composed of more varied elements, addressed itself to a more benevolent purpose, exercised in a more exemplary manner the spirit of mutual forbearance, brotherly kindness, and enlightened, earnest co-operation, or accomplished its object with an efficiency in which is more clearly discernible the evidence of that 'blessing from the God of mercy,' for which its several members were exhorted by their reverend brother, who suggested the movement, to 'look up.' May that Gracious Being confirm and strengthen this fraternal regard, and bring them together again into the same active and cordial union, whenever his Providence shall afford an occasion for combined benevolent exertion in the cause of suffering humanity!"

UNIVERSITY REFORM.

When Parliament meets, this subject, in one of its branches at least, will, it is hoped, receive its early attention. When the University Acts of 1854 and 1856 were passed, the improvement of College constitutions was left to Commissioners, appointed for Oxford in 1854, and for Cambridge in 1856. These Commissioners have either quietly ignored the existence of Dissenters, as in the case of the Oxford Commission of 1854, or, after suggesting the moderate compromise of students not members of the Church of England being allowed to absent themselves from Church-of-England services, they have (as in the case of the Cambridge Commission now sitting) yielded to College influence, and dropped their intended measure of conciliation, and left Dissenting students, absolutely under a College ecclesiastical board, to attend Church services. Mr. Pollard-Urquhart, M.P., will probably on an early day move the House that an Address be presented to the Crown, praying Her Majesty to withhold her consent from the statutes of the two great Colleges of Trinity and St. John's as sanctioned by the Commissioners, inasmuch as they do not respect the rights intended to be secured to Nonconformist members of the University. The Unitarian Association has issued a circular stating the facts of the case, and urging its friends

to petition Parliament and correspond with Members of the House of Commons, and to ask their support of Mr. Pollard-Urquhart's motion.

A NEW UNITARIAN PERIODICAL.

We take a passage or two from a little periodical which has just started into existence in the West, called *The Devonshire Watchman:*

"It has been judged desirable that the Dissenters of this county who carry their Protestantism to the fullest and most consistent extent should be better represented than they have for some years past been, and should render a more suitable contribution to the necessities of these remarkable times, and help forward somewhat more eminently the sacred cause of evangelical truth and righteousness. This little work, of which the first eight pages are published with the commencement of the year 1860, may constitute a closer bond of union than at present subsists among a few churches of Christ's disciples, that are inferior to none in real attachment to the Saviour and in sincere goodwill to the highest welfare of the human race. We think it may be made to appear that much misrepresentation covers those churches that are inferior to none in the true grounds of respectability, in researches to arrive at truth themselves, or in philanthropic wishes, whatever their actual services recently, to spread the pure gospel of Christ. In one remarkable respect the county of Devon is distinguished by the first struggle for what Sir Isaac Newton has called 'the long-lost truth.' We apprehend that the city of Exeter, whose secular motto is *Semper fidelis*, was the first among the cities of England to erect a *church* for the worship of the *Father*, the *only living* and *true God*, in the name of our blessed Saviour, in which the disciples of Christ might worship God according to the sacred command, independently of the favour of the world; aided by ministers who enjoyed the highest advantages of learning and science, to enable them to act as pioneers in the march of liberal religion and Christian knowledge. Such were Hallett and Peirce, at the very beginning of the eighteenth century, for whom a spacious chapel was erected by the opulent merchants of Exeter. The writer distinctly remembers on the entablature of that simple temple, near the ancient Mint, the date of 1719, and rejoices that Providence permits him, after a long period of ministerial service, to make one effort more for truth and Christ and God. May it be acceptable and useful! At a later period, as the century advanced, we have to record the honoured names of Micaiah Towgood, Merivale, Bretland, Kenrick, Carpenter, Manning and Acton, men of great strength and mental acuteness, furnished with large stores of biblical wisdom, and animated with the spirit of zeal for farther and more complete reformation. We shall probably, if this humble effort be successful, sketch the leading characteristics of these holy men, of whom the world, agitated and torn by political factions, was scarcely worthy. We may, by this means, draw out for the benefit of our Devonshire fellow-countrymen some of that admiration to which these ministers of Christ were eminently entitled, but which too inadequately they have hitherto received."

EXTRACTS FROM THE TIMES ON THE PROPOSED REVISION OF THE LITURGY.

Lord Ebury's agitation for the revision of the Liturgy is producing some good results. In the *Times* of Jan. 4, he publishes an able letter of a clergyman, son of the late distinguished Bishop of Lincoln (Dr. Kaye), from which the following extract is worthy of note: "As a body the clergy do not sufficiently bear in mind the fact that, side by side with our Church, there has been growing up a numerous body of Christians, many of them able and pious men, but not in connection with it; and that in our efforts to render the Established Church a national Church, we ought to recognize the existence and excellence (albeit with some defects in order and system) of our Nonconforming brethren. The reform which I most desire in the Church is a feeling of Christian fellowship towards these religious bodies, for the anomalous position of which we are in no small degree responsible. I am very fearful of that exclusive spirit which enters so largely into what is called the High school in our Church, and from which even the opposite school is not wholly free."

"There is not one clergyman of the whole list who have just petitioned for a Commission to make doctrinal alterations in the Prayer-Book, who has the most distant intention of giving up his preferment if his recommendation is not attended to. The two parties in the Church now do not dream of separation or secession; they have not the faintest design, either of them, of retiring from the common fold and leaving the rival section in possession of it."—*Times*, January 6.

Lord Ebury, the *Times* goes on to say, must not expect any spirited and warlike support from his constituents who regard him as their leader. There are probably

not half-a-dozen among his clerical partizans who care two straws about the issue, according to any tangible test of solicitude. He also says that it is not probable that any statesman will lend himself to a movement for a doctrinal reform of the English Prayer-Book, which proceeds upon such a weak basis as this. An English statesman has to do with real grievances which cry earnestly and aloud for remedies, not with themes for comfortable grumbling and with scruples which display such exemplary patience under trial that they rather invite a longer trial than a dangerous cure. The writer thinks that the appointment of a fair representative Commission for a revision of the Prayer-Book would only be the beginning of an endless quarrel.

OBITUARY.

THE LATE REV. WILLIAM HARRISON.

The retired life of a Christian minister cannot offer much to interest the general reader, and can scarcely solicit more than the passing glance of curiosity or respect. It is in the family alone that the reminiscences are held sacred, and in the affections of children that the obituary is truly written. Yet it is proper to record the death of one who had spent a long life in the advocacy of Unitarian doctrines and the teachings of religion, and whose ancestors had for many generations been consistent in the maintenance of rational Christianity.

The Rev. Wm. Harrison died on Nov. 30th, at Higher Broughton, near Manchester, in the 81st year of his age. He had been for upwards of 50 years the minister of a small chapel at Blackley, near Manchester, where he had gained the affections of his congregation by the kindness of his disposition and his unvarying affability to the poor. Mr. Harrison was descended from a highly respectable Lancashire family. It may be remembered that his father was co-pastor with Dr. Barnes at the Unitarian chapel in Cross Street, Manchester. The advantages which might have been derived from his social position never seduced him from the humble line of life which he considered to be his fitting destination. Though of literary tastes and fond of studious retirement, Mr. Harrison was not much known as an author. He was perhaps too distrustful of his own abilities to devote himself to original inquiries. He published a posthumous volume of his father's sermons, and also a second edition of the excellent English Grammar which emanated from the same pen. The former work has prefixed to it a brief memoir of the Rev. Ralph Harrison, which may be considered as a fair specimen of his style of composition. The latter period of Mr. Harrison's life made large demands on the Christian fortitude which it had been the business of his life to inculcate on others. A long illness rendered him incapable of moving from his chamber, and finally denied him the solace which he had so long found in reading. He bore all with meekness and patience, without one word of repining against the will of the Most High. He had always a smile of welcome for the friends who visited him, and a cordial grasp of affection greeted their taking leave.

He was interred by the Rev. W. Gaskell, M.A., on the 5th of December, 1859, at Blackley, which was the seat of his labours, and on the following Sunday an able discourse was preached by the same gentleman from the words, "And thou shalt go to thy Father's in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age."

J. B. H.

Jan. 3, at his residence, Fordham, Cambridgeshire, after long and severe illness, Mr. ROBERT D. FYSON. He was a skilled and scientific farmer, and a man of vigorous sense and of kind and generous dispositions. He and his excellent father were among the early friends of the late Rev. Robert Aspland, who was born in the neighbouring village of Wicken. The friendship continued unbroken during life, and the memory of their father's friend is now affectionately cherished by the children of him who was first called away.

Dec. 7, in the 66th year of her age, ANN, widow of the late Jeremiah LEES, Esq., of Kelsall House, Stalybridge.

Dec. 11, Rev. W. DAVIES, Ph.D., Tutor in Hebrew and the Mathematics at the Presbyterian College, Carmarthen. His good sense, amiability and moderation, made him respected and beloved alike by colleagues and pupils and friends.

Dec. 26, after a short illness, EMMA, wife of John S. DRENNAN, Esq., M.D., of Belfast, and daughter of Rev. W. Hincks, of Toronto, aged 33.

Dec. 29, Mr. CHAS. CHATFIELD CLARKE, East Street, Chichester.

Dec. 29, at Preston, aged 37, ROBERT PRESTON RODICK, Esq., of Woodclose, Westmoreland, Justice of the Peace for the county of Lancaster.

Dec. 31, at Streatham Paragon, Brixton Hill, SAMUEL SANGSTER, Esq., in his 82nd year.

Jan. 3, at Shepton Mallet, Somerset, after a few hours' illness, Mrs. ANN NAYLER, wife of Rev. John Nayler, minister of the Cowl-Street chapel in that town, aged 66 years.

Jan. 4, at Great Yarmouth, Norfolk, MARY ANN, widow of the late Mr. John SHORT, aged 68 years.

Jan. 8, aged 59, MARY, wife of Mr. Thomas HANDS, of York.

Jan. 12, at the house of her sister, 24, Regent Street, St. James's, Miss SARAH CARPENTER, youngest daughter of the late Mr. George Carpenter, in the 71st year of her age.

Jan. 19, at Chester, in his eighth year, EDWARD HENRY, son of Mr. Edward JOHNSON, of Abbot's Cottage, Chester.

Jan. 21, at Leamington, Rev. BENJAMIN CARPENTER, of Nottingham. [We request some one of the many friends of this useful and excellent minister to furnish us with a Memoir of his public life.]

Jan. 21, at his residence, Hyde, Cheshire, in his 59th year, Mr. SAMUEL HIBBERT. Gifted with good sense and a clear judgment, his temper amiable and his whole character well balanced, he made himself throughout life eminently useful and respected. Devoting himself to business in the cotton manufacture, by his steady application and unswerving integrity he attained a position of usefulness and influence, beloved by those whom he employed and respected by all the employers of his neighbourhood. To the members of the family to which he belonged and to all who had any claim upon him, the counsels of his natural sagacity and experience were ever freely given. His death makes a void which will not be easily filled. He was, as his father had been before him, a firm friend of civil and religious liberty, and throughout his life rendered liberal assistance, both by his personal influence and his pecuniary aid, to whatever would promote good government, liberal principles and sound education. Avoiding all violent extremes, he was one on whom his friends knew that they could always confidently rely in every question where a principle was at stake. In the movement which resulted in the emancipation of trade from protective restrictions, he was a zealous fellow-labourer. His last public act was to encourage by his presence at a meeting of the inhabitants of Hyde (at which he took the chair and gave a liberal subscription) the formation of a Rifle Corps. In religion he was from personal conviction a Unitarian Christian. As a member of the zealous society at Gee Cross, he was always forward in every good congregational work. His removal from the scene of usefulness which he adorned by his unostentatious virtues was sudden. Prostrated by unexpected disease, he learnt from his medical advisers that the sands of life were rapidly running down; he received the intelligence with the calmness of a Christian's fortitude, and employed the few remaining minutes of life in an act of brotherly forethought and love. To the warmly-attached members of his family, his departure is a cause of lasting sorrow.

REV. GEORGE HARRIS.

In our last No. we announced the sad event of the death of this eminent and popular minister. Of the impressive scene of his funeral we do not intend now to dwell; deeper sorrow affecting a larger number of persons on any public occasion we have rarely seen. We have the melancholy satisfaction of announcing that a Memoir of Mr. Harris's public life is in hand by a friend able to do full justice to the task, and will be given in our pages. We hope the first portion of it will appear in our next No.

From several of the pulpits of our ministers appropriate tributes to Mr. Harris's public services have been paid. The following, by Rev. Edmund Kell, of Southampton, has been placed in our hands:

"While speaking of the responsibility of life, and our duty to employ its fleeting moments to our highest, our spiritual benefit, my thoughts will turn to a life which has now passed from among us to its everlasting reward—I refer to the Rev. George Harris, of Newcastle-on-Tyne. To some among you, the high qualities of this eminent being, either as a man amongst men or as a minister of the gospel, are well known. As a man, his sterling independence, moral courage and integrity, united with true, warm-hearted friendship and Christian philanthropy, commanded for him the affection and respect, not only of those who thought and laboured with him in the great sympathies of life,

but of many who differed widely from him in religious and political opinion. As a preacher, I need hardly say to you that he possessed the highest characteristics of an orator; for his masculine understanding, strength of reasoning and tenderness of feeling, were well sustained by his admirable elocution and noble, manly bearing. He was through life the unvarying friend of civil and religious liberty in all its shades and ramifications, and in some instances was eminently instrumental in promoting its great objects. A sermon of his against the Tithe system, preached in consequence of the massacre by the soldiery in the seizure of tithes, at Rathcormac, went through about twenty editions, and did much to abolish a most obnoxious mode of obtaining that unrighteous impost. In early life he took an active part, in conjunction with Major Cartright, in urging forward a Reform in the House of Commons, going to the very verge of personal danger in his advocacy of a more general representation of the people. He was equally zealous for the repeal of the Corn-laws. But it was as a reformer of our laws of criminal jurisprudence that the Rev. George Harris is perhaps most entitled to the nation's gratitude. As is often the case with those who are the pioneers of improvement, he never had his due meed of praise as the first to popularize the opinion of the impolicy, futility and cruelty of death punishment. In labours for the diffusion of more clement views touching the treatment of offenders, at a time when an almost incredible number of offences were punished with death, he went through many of the large towns of England and Scotland, and often, midst obloquy and opposition, lectured against capital punishment; and by the force of his strong, clear reasoning and powerful eloquence, attracted large audiences, sometimes, as in the Birmingham Town-hall, amounting to three thousand. It is not too much to say that the public mind was on this question much influenced by his appeals; for though the principles he advocated had been successfully laid down by various jurisprudists in their writings, it was mainly reserved for him to bring them forward for the appreciation and acceptance of the people. The efforts of the Rev. G. Harris for the abolition of slavery, and more recently in forwarding sanitary reform, were alike persevering and energetic, and only less conspicuous because others participated in the philanthropic labour of forming on these points a more enlightened public sentiment. But the reform which was always nearest and dearest to this Christian pastor's heart, and to the accomplishment of which he most consecrated his powers, was *religious* reform —the clearing away the corruptions of Christianity, the restoration of the gospel of Christ to the purity in which it was bequeathed by its great Founder and his apostles. This reform was ever to him a sacred duty, even from the period when, as a student of Glasgow University, he went on Sundays to Greenock to plant the standard of Unitarian Christianity in that town, to the time when, only two days before that last pulpit service in which his strength failed him, he penned to me perhaps his last letter, which concludes with the words, 'The *missionary* spirit goes *bravely* on in Lancashire, Cheshire, Yorkshire and Derbyshire.' When he first settled as a minister in Lancashire, he entered with zeal on the missionary labours at a time when the general body of Unitarians were not altogether ripe for the enterprize. He continued ever after to be the life and soul of missionary efforts, and his valuable ministerial services were often put in requisition by those of his brother ministers who sympathized with him on the importance of diffusing the opinions which seemed to them most accordant with the 'truth as it is in Jesus.' Chiefly to urge forward the missionary movement, he published for twenty years a monthly religious periodical, intended 'to uphold the great doctrines of the Reformation, the sufficiency of Scripture, the right of private judgment and of fearless free inquiry,' which, meeting a popular want, had considerable circulation, and was sustained by him with zealous though often unrequited labour. After its discontinuance, he edited another monthly religious periodical, entitled, 'The Christian Pilot.' Those only who have engaged in such publications can fully estimate the anxiety and trouble they entail, and the gratitude due from the public to the generous zeal which conducts them.

"That earnestness of devotion to the diffusion of Christian truth which gave so much heart and efficacy to his own pulpit exhortations, he lived to see become the *feeling* with which almost all the earnest men of our body are more and more impressed, and it rejoiced his heart to witness the missionary efforts of many of our churches. It was my privilege to visit him during his illness not many weeks before his death, and to hear him speak with a glow of animation of those better and brighter times coming when the superstitions and false doctrines encrusted on the truths of Christianity shall disappear, and the gospel light shall shine in its unsullied and unrivalled purity.

"But let not any suppose that the Rev. George Harris was one of those who in his conversations or pulpit ministrations was always dwelling on points of discordant faith. No! These he brought forward at suitable times when the exigency of the occasion required it. But the secret of his great success and strength through life was, that the *affirmative* doctrines of the gospel were preached by him in all their holy importance, that the ever-beaming love of our Heavenly Father in sending his Son into the world to call sinners to repentance was ever prominent, that he was ever ready to extend the soothing invitation to the sinner to return to his Father's house. There was no barrenness in the pasture to which for so many years he invited his successive flocks at Liverpool, Bolton, Glasgow, Edinburgh and Newcastle, or he could not have so carried with him the hearts and affections of his people. It was the great practical truths and precepts of the gospel on which he most delighted to dwell, swaying the hearts of men all the more powerfully because not weakened and overborne by human traditions or superstitions or a spurious philosophy.

"That eloquent tongue is now mute. That philanthropic breast has ceased to glow. That powerful arm is no longer upraised in the cause of religion and philanthropy. But we will fondly cherish the hope that others, looking on what he has done for his 'day and generation,' will strive to walk in his footsteps. We will send up the fervent prayer which our Saviour taught us to offer, that our God would 'send forth more labourers into his vineyard.' And, above all, O! let us one and all resolve to copy his spirit, and to battle manfully for that sacred cause of gospel truth and righteousness, in labouring for which the brother we have lost left us so bright an example! Amen."

The Rev. R. B. Drummond delivered a discourse in St. Mark's chapel, Edinburgh, on New-year's-day, in which he alluded to the important and valuable labours of the Rev. George Harris for the promotion of Unitarianism in Scotland. The preacher thus referred to his stay in Edinburgh: "To you, my beloved friends, the intelligence of the decease of your former pastor will have come as a grief and a pain. It is now nearly twenty years since he became your minister. In the year 1841, he removed from Glasgow to this city, where he laboured earnestly and successfully during nearly four years. Often have you heard these walls ring with his eloquent denunciations of what he deemed the soul-oppressing errors of the prevailing religion, with his earnest appeals in behalf of truth, and his emphatic warnings against sin. . . During the course of this last summer you enjoyed the opportunity of once more seeing the familiar form, once more hearing the familiar voice, in the place that formerly had known them both so well. But, alas! not the same power as of old dwelt upon his lips. You saw with sorrow that his energies had declined; but you fondly hoped perhaps that he might still be permitted to continue his labours for some time longer, or at least to live to enjoy the honours of old age. But it seemed otherwise to Providence; and now he is gone—gone, haply in some other sphere to serve his God, and meet his reward in closer communion with the Father of spirits. May the memory of this good man long remain amongst us, to encourage us all to 'go and do likewise!'"

From Edinburgh also the following letter has been forwarded to Mrs. Harris:

"Edinburgh, January, 1860.

"Dear Madam,—We have been instructed by the Committee of Management of St. Mark's chapel here, to convey to you the feeling of sincere, deep and affectionate sympathy, which the Committee and Congregation entertain towards you and your family in your recent sad bereavement. Our Father in heaven, who doeth all things well, has in His wisdom and love seen fit to release from his labours here below, and to call home to Himself, our venerable, respected and much-loved friend, your dear departed husband. We, too, mourn for him; but we trust it is in the spirit taught to many of us by himself when, as our pastor and friend, he instructed and consoled us in those heavy trials incident to our common lot. His labours of love amongst us then, and also his words fitly spoken, and deeds of kindness done to many of us since, will long remain in our grateful recollection. His name also will ever be remembered and his memory cherished, for the dauntless courage, the fervour, power and eloquence he displayed in the public defence and propagation of our holy and benevolent faith, and which he taught no less effectually by the purity of his life in his private walk and conversation. His unwearied labours from his youth upwards constituted him for many, many years the great preacher in this country of a free and loving Christianity, so that when the history of Christian Unitarianism in Scotland shall come to be written, there will be no name more honoured amongst its first apostles than that of the Rev. George Harris. We will never again see his face or hear the tones of his voice here; he can-

not come to us; but, thanks be to God! we know from the gospel of Jesus that death is only the appointed way to a higher life, and that by a like patient continuance in well-doing, and by the same ceaseless activity in every cause which tends to promote the prosperity, happiness, purity and holiness of our brother man, which so distinguished him, we may encourage the glorious hope of a blissful re-union where sorrow and death shall be no more, and where God himself shall wipe away all tears from our eyes. May He who has promised to be a Husband to the widow and a Father to the fatherless ever comfort and sustain you, is the earnest prayer of your attached friends.

"Signed on behalf of the Committee and congregation, by

GEORGE HOPE, Chairman.
ROBERT B. DRUMMOND, Minister.
JOHN H. DUNN, Secretary."

Resolutions have been passed on the subject of Mr. Harris's services to our cause by the Newcastle congregation and by the Unitarian Association. The funeral address and sermon are, at the request of the Newcastle congregation, about to be sent to the press.

MARRIAGES.

Nov. 23, in the church of the First Presbyterian congregation, Rosemary Street, Belfast, by Rev. William Bruce, assisted by Rev. J. Scott Porter, SAMUEL BARBOUR, of New York, to MARGARET AULD, second daughter of John RIDDEL, Esq., of Beechmount, Belfast.

Nov. 27, at Bank-Street chapel, Bolton, by Rev. Franklin Baker, M.A., Mr. JAMES HOPE to ANN, daughter of Mr. J. BROWN, of Bolton.

Nov. 27, at Elder-Yard chapel, Chesterfield, by Rev. Francis Bishop, Mr. JOSEPH FEARN to Miss MARY JANE GOODWIN COOPER, both of Chesterfield.

Dec. 17, at Bank-Street chapel, Bolton, by Rev. Franklin Baker, M.A., Mr. THOS. AINSWORTH to SARAH, daughter of Mr. Wm. REDFORD, all of Turton, near Bolton.

Dec. 17, in the Unitarian chapel, Portsmouth, by Rev. H. Hawkes, JOHN DAVID THOMSON, of Aldershott, to JULIA BOWERS, of Portsmouth.

Dec. 18, at Lord-Street chapel, Oldham, by Rev. C. W. Robberds, JOHN CHADWICK to HENRIETTA THOMPSON, both of Royton, Lancashire.

Dec. 19, at Bank-Street chapel, Bolton, by Rev. Franklin Baker, M.A., Mr. ISAAC BARROW to HANNAH, daughter of Mr. John TAYLOR, of Bolton.

Dec. 22, at Barton-Street chapel, Gloucester, by Rev. J. G. Teggin, Mr. THOMAS GOODE to Miss SARAH HOOPER, both of that city.

Dec. 24, at the Presbyterian chapel, Newbury, by Rev. R. Shelley, Mr. GEORGE GILE, schoolmaster, of Llandilo Fawr, Carmarthenshire, to Miss CHARLOTTE RAPSON, of Newbury.

Dec. 25, at the Old meeting-house, Nicholas Street, Ipswich, by Rev. J. T. Cooper, Mr. JOHN COOKE, of St. George's Hospital, London, to ELIZA, only daughter of Mr. William FIRTH, Handford House, Ipswich.

Dec. 26, at the Old meeting-house, Ipswich, by Rev. J. T. Cooper, Mr. WALTER J. SCOPES to AGNES, youngest daughter of Mr. Richard GOWING, Victoria Street, Ipswich.

Dec. 27, at the Old meeting-house, Birmingham, by Rev. Charles Clarke, Mr. EDWIN GRIFFITHS to ROSA, third daughter of the late Mr. Richard TIMMINS, Balsall Heath.

Dec. 27, at the High-Pavement chapel, Nottingham, by Rev. Wm. Blaseby, B.A., Mr. WILLIAM NORWEB to MARY, daughter of Mr. Jas. SEDGWICK, both of Nottingham.

Dec. 31, at the High-Pavement chapel, Nottingham, by Rev. Wm. Blaseby, B.A., Mr. WILLIAM ELLIS to ELIZABETH ANN SIMONS.

Jan. 10, at the parish church, Brighton, by Rev. T. Hutchinson, M.A., vicar of Ditchling, Sussex, brother-in-law of the bridegroom, HENRY JOHN BAXTER, Esq., barrister-at-law, of Ladbroke Square, London, and Gatley, Cheshire, to EMMELINE, daughter of William BAYLEY, Esq., of Stamford Lodge, Stalybridge.

Jan. 11, at Bank-Street chapel, Bolton, by Rev. Franklin Baker, M.A., Mr. JOHN WARD, of Turton, to Mrs. ANN WADDELOVE, of Longworth.

Jan. 12, at the Unitarian chapel, Upper Brook Street, by Rev. F. Baker, M.A., JOHN H. M'KEAND, Esq., of Lowton, to MARY BUCKLEY, eldest daughter of the late Peter LIVSEY, Esq., of Barton-upon-Irwell.

Jan. 16, at the Unitarian church, Preston, by Rev. W. O. Squier, Mr. JOHN RIBCHESTER to Miss HANNAH WESTLEY, both of Preston.

Jan. 17, at the parish church, Bolton, by Rev. P. A. Galindo, B.A., assisted by the vicar of Bolton, JOHN LEECH, Jun., Esq., of Stalybridge, to ELIZA, the youngest daughter of Henry ASHWORTH, Esq., the Oaks, near Bolton.

THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CLXXXIII.] MARCH, 1860. [VOL. XVI.

THEODORE PARKER.*

THE sudden retirement of this brave man and diligent student, owing to serious disease of the lungs, would be a fit occasion for reviewing his public life, even if he had not invited such review by his autobiographical letter to his late congregation. While we cordially express our deep admiration of his character and acts just where action is especially the test of American character, and have also, we trust, a true appreciation of him beyond our agreement with his opinions, we must not hesitate to speak plainly on what seems to us his very equivocal position towards Christianity and the Christian church. This is our plain duty (just now especially) as Unitarian Christians, who adhere to the belief of a supernatural revelation of the Divine Will, and who cannot reconcile with this belief a philosophy which insists that miracle and inspiration are impossible, or (which comes, we think, to the same thing) that they belong to all ages and places alike.

The true glory of Theodore Parker consists in the fearless opposition which he has made to Slavery, against which he tells us he has "spoken more than any concrete wrong, because it is the greatest of all, 'the sum of all villanies,' and the most popular, the wanton darling of the government." His practical defiance of the Fugitive Slave Bill was a matter of course with such a man; and he recalls that exciting time with evident pride in his letter to his flock: "Then I preached against slavery as never before, and defied the impudent statute, whereto you happily said *Amen* by the first clapping of hands which for years had welcomed a sermon in Boston; how could you help the natural indecorum?" (p. 94). He soon brought upon himself a state prosecution by "gibbeting the wrong before the eyes of the people," by "preaching against the jackals of slavery," and (if we remember rightly) by harbouring fugitives in his own house. And then he made the preliminary stages of the prosecution too hot with righteous indignation for American justice to venture upon bringing him to trial. Honour to Theodore

* Theodore Parker's Experience as a Minister, with some Account of his Early Life and Education for the Ministry; contained in a Letter from him to the Members of the Twenty-eighth Congregational Society of Boston. Pp. 128. London—E. T. Whitfield. 1859.

Parker for so using his giant strength! It is not every man, with the same deep and resolute sense of right, that *could* do precisely this. Few have the same personal prowess, the same dauntless bearing, the same iron nerve, the same combative power, or the same popular speech. William Ellery Channing, whose bravery in writing as he did on Slavery and on the Texas Annexation has not been surpassed even by Parker, would certainly never have flinched before the public prosecutor; but he could not perhaps have frightened the latter away before the trial was to come on. Nor perhaps would he have brandished with grand and scornful defiance the trenchant speech which *was to have been spoken*, when occasion for speaking it had so satisfactorily failed him. But Parker

> "Fought all the battle o'er again;
> And thrice he routed all his foes,
> And thrice he slew his slain."

It was one of the finest passages that has yet occurred in the Anti-slavery struggle. Theodore Parker was doubly in his element, rejoicing in the excitement of conflict, and feeling that he was fighting for the cause of humanity. He declares, indeed, in his letter to his friends at Boston, that he does not love conflict: "I may as well confess it, after all, I am not much of a fighter; my affections are developed far better than my intellect. It may be news to the public; to YOU it is but too well known" (p. 105). Nevertheless, we of the public (to whom this is indeed news) involuntarily derive from his own writings the constant impression that his intellect is very prominently developed in the direction of strong dogmatic thought, love of argument and controversy; and we perpetually feel in reading him that, with all his intrinsic nobleness and generosity, and possibly tenderness of feeling, he pursues his metaphysical and theological speculations with a most rude disregard to the convictions, and still more to the religious feelings and sentiments, of persons as earnestly religious as himself; whom he "*gibbets*" almost as relentlessly for what he thinks their backward theology, as he does his pro-slavery opponents for their backward morals and humanity. But in the affair of the Fugitive Slave Bill, where the most palpable wrongs were to be resisted and redressed, his deep sense of justice and right was not less evident than his controversial prowess; and in no passage of his life were the two great elements of his mind and character jointly roused to such intense and noble action. Theodore Parker was truly great on that occasion. Perhaps a gentler spirit could not have done his work. He has been compared to Luther for the combination of strong affections with intellectual power and moral bravery in conflict. The two men were, we believe, not unlike in power and bravery. And the only misapplication of the parallel is,

when it is applied beyond the work of the anti-slavery man to that of the theologian.

As a diligent student and comprehensive, if not always careful or minute scholar, Theodore Parker must ever command our admiration. It is rarely found that so much reading can be combined with such activity in social and political life. He possesses, beyond a doubt, great natural gifts of apprehension and memory; and it is plain that the comparative leisure of his early ministerial life at Roxbury was most diligently devoted to the study of books. His translation of De Wette's *Introduction to the Old Testament*, and his additions to it, are proof of his large and varied learning, whatever we may think of some of his critical conclusions.

We turn now to his theology and philosophy. The two are indeed one and the same. In his "Experience" he repeats in summary what he has developed at large in his various publications, and most methodically in his *Discourse of Matters pertaining to Religion*. We shall briefly state in his own words his theory of religion; and we must calmly inquire what is its true position as regards Christianity.

Mr. Parker thus describes what he calls *the Absolute Religion:*

"I found certain great primal Intuitions of Human Nature, which depend on no logical process of demonstration, but are rather facts of consciousness given by the instinctive action of human nature itself. I will mention only the three most important which pertain to Religion.

"1. The Instinctive Intuition of the Divine, the consciousness that there is a God.

"2. The Instinctive Intuition of the Just and Right, a consciousness that there is a Moral Law, independent of our will, which we ought to keep.

"3. The Instinctive Intuition of the Immortal, a consciousness that the Essential Element of man, the principle of Individuality, never dies.

"Here, then, was the foundation of Religion, laid in human nature itself, which neither the atheist nor the more pernicious bigot, with their sophisms of denial or affirmation, could move or even shake. I had gone through the great spiritual trial of my life, telling no one of my hopes or fears, and I thought it a triumph that I had psychologically established these three things to my own satisfaction, and devised a scheme which to the scholar's mind, I thought, could legitimate what was spontaneously given to all by the great primal Instincts of Mankind."—Pp. 15, 16.

Again, he says:

"For these three great doctrines—of God, of Man, of Religion—I have depended on no Church and no Scripture; yet have I found things to serve me in all Scriptures and every Church. I have sought my authority in the Nature of Man—in facts of consciousness within me, and facts of observation in the human world without. To me the Material World and the outward History of man do not supply a sufficient revelation of God, nor warrant me to speak of Infinite Perfection.

It is only from the Nature of Man, from facts of intuition, that I can gather this greatest of all truths, as I find it in my consciousness reflected back from Deity itself.

"I know well what may be said of the 'Feebleness of all the Human Faculties,' their 'unfaithfulness and unfitness for their work;' that the mind is not adequate for man's intellectual function, nor the conscience for the moral, nor the affections for the philanthropic, nor the soul for the religious, nor even the body for the corporeal, but that each requires miraculous help from a God who is only outside of Humanity! There is a denial which boldly rejects the Immortality of Man and the existence of Deity, with many another doctrine dear and precious to mankind: but the most dangerous scepticism is that which, professing allegiance to all these, and crossing itself at the name of Jesus, is yet so false to the great Primeval Instinct of Man, that it declares he cannot be certain of anything he learns by the normal exercise of any faculty! I have carefully studied this School of Doubt, modern, not less than old, as it appears in history. In it there are honest inquirers after truth, but misled by some accident; and also sophists, who live by their sleight of mind, as jugglers by their dexterity of hand. But the chief members of this body are the Mockers, who, in a world they make empty, find the most fitting echo to their hideous laugh; and Churchmen of all denominations, who are so anxious to support their ecclesiastic theology, that they think it is not safe on its throne till they have annihilated the claim of Reason, Conscience, the Affections, and the Soul to any voice in determining the greatest concerns of man—thinking there is no place for the Christian Church or the Bible till they have nullified the faculties which have created both, and rendered Bible-makers and Church-founders impossible. But it is rather a poor compliment these ecclesiastic sceptics pay their Deity to say He so makes and manages the world that we cannot trust the sights we see, the sounds we hear, the thoughts we think, or the moral, affectional, religious emotions we feel; that we are certain neither of the intuitions of instinct, nor the demonstrations of reason, but yet by some anonymous testimony can be made sure that Balaam's she-ass spoke certain Hebrew words, and one undivided third part of God was 'born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, descended into Hell, and the third day rose again,' to take away the wrath which the other two undivided third parts of God felt against all mankind!"—Pp. 51—53.

These two quotations will together sufficiently explain both Mr. Parker's own views and also his habitual mode of speaking of Christianity and Christians and the Scriptures. By way of clearing the ground from secondary questions, we observe first on the latter. It seems to us strange, and very far from right, that Mr. Parker, who was educated among Unitarians, who knows their views, and speaks not unfrequently with a certain respect for them and their theological position as distinguished from Calvinism, Trinitarianism and Bibliolatry, should habitually neglect this distinction when he is advocating his own Absolute Religion as opposed to Christianity. The second extract above given is a sample of this continually repeated injus-

tice, mixed with its usual coarseness. The alternative is falsely represented as lying between what he calls the "Absolute Religion" and that dull orthodox bibliolatry which receives the Church Prayer-book also as infallible, and which does not need Parker's sledge-hammer to smash to pieces, as it has long since undergone the more discriminating application of biblical criticism and exegetics. This mode of representing the question is not fair, except on the part of one who (as we are inclined to believe was the case with Thomas Paine) *honestly but ignorantly* identifies the religion of the Scriptures with that of the least enlightened sects or individual Christians. The description (in the last paragraph of the second extract) of "what may be said" by those who do depend on Scripture (if not rather on church), is a gross burlesque upon what even the more reasonable of the orthodox would say, as it mixes up follies of biblical interpretation and the extra-biblical doctrine of the Trinity in one confused mass, and represents the belief in every absurd and untenable principle of reasoning, as well as absurd interpretation of Scripture, as the alternative for those who do not accept the "Absolute Religion." This, we repeat, might be fair in Tom Paine, who knew no better; but is not fair in Theodore Parker, who knows better.

Mr. Parker's estimate of the Scriptures is either very complex or very inconsistent. He seems to take delight in disparaging them by the gross over-statement of critical facts which are true to a certain degree in the knowledge of every scholar, and also by gratuitous slurs thrown on them in passing; yet every now and then he speaks of them with seeming reverence. The Bible is with him "a collection of quite heterogeneous books, most of them anonymous, or bearing names of doubtful authors, collected none knows how, or when, or by whom; united more by caprice than any philosophic or historic method" (p. 12). The Old Testament is, again (p. 31), "an anonymous Hebrew book;" and the New Testament, "an anonymous Greek book," teaching "that man is born totally depraved, and God will perpetually slaughter men in hell by the million, though they had committed no fault, except that of not believing an absurd doctrine they had never heard of." This we call too bad. It is a mere *argumentum ad Calvinum.* It is simply false respecting the Bible, though true of certain unscriptural creeds. Christianity is (p. 50) one of "the six great historic forms of religion—the Brahmanic, Hebrew, Classic, Buddhistic, Christian, Mohammedan;" and of all the six alike it is said, that "spite of the excellence which they contain, and the vast service the humblest of them has done, yet each must ere long prove a hindrance to human welfare." In his *Discourse of Religion,* Abraham is "a mythological character of some excellence," and Moses "another and greater mythological hero" (p. 164). Throughout his Discourses

he constantly speaks of Jesus Christ in such a way as pointedly to preclude the miraculous, by coupling him with others besides the greatest of great men. Yet, on the other hand, he says, "The critical study of the Bible only enhanced my reverence for the great and good things I found in the Old Testament and New;" and, "To me the name of Christianity is most exceeding dear, significant of so great a man and of such natural emotions, ideas and actions, as are of priceless value to mankind." But Parker makes it perfectly clear, at all events, that he ascribes nothing miraculous or inspired to the contents of the Bible:

"I have taken exquisite delight in the grand words of the Bible, putting it before all other sacred literature of the whole ancient world: to me it is more dear when I regard them not as the miracles of God, but as the work of earnest men, who did their uttermost with holy heart. I love to read the great Truths of Religion set forth in the magnificent poetry of Psalmist and Prophet, and the humane lessons of the Hebrew peasant, who summed up the Prophets and the Law in one word of LOVE, and set forth man's daily duties in such true and simple speech! As a Master, the Bible were a tyrant; as a Help, I have not time to tell its worth; nor has a sick man speech for that, nor need I now, for my public and private teachings sufficiently abound in such attempts. But yet to me the great men of the Bible are worth more than all their words; he that was greater than the Temple, whose soul burst out its walls, is also greater than the Testament, but yet no Master over you or me, however humble men!"—Pp. 99, 100.

He says expressly (p. 101), "I have departed from the fundamental principle of the Catholics and the Protestants, *denied the fact of a miraculous revelation*, given exclusively to Jews and Christians, *denied the claim to supernatural authority*, and utterly broken with that vicariousness which puts an alleged revelation in place of common sense, and the blood of a crucified Jew instead of excellence of character." (Again a passage worthy of Tom Paine, confounding the Scriptures with the creed-books.) Parker goes on, however, in the next sentences, to claim a *divine mission* for himself:

"In the least historic of the New Testament Gospels it is related that Jesus miraculously removed the congenital blindness of an adult man, and because he made known the fact that his eyes were thus opened, and told the cause, the Pharisees cast him out of their synagogue. What this mythic story relates as an exceptional measure of the Pharisees, seems to have founded a Universal Principle of the Christian Church, which cannot bear the presence of a man who, *divinely sent*, has washed in the pool of Siloam, and returned seeing and telling why."—P. 102.

He records his early conviction "that no part of the Old Testament or New could be called the 'Word of God,' save in the sense that all truth is God's word." And he speaks of his subsequent attainment of "that philosophical idea of God which

makes a theological miracle as impossible as a round triangle, or any other self-evident contradiction (p. 10).

There should be no mistake, after reading such statements, in assigning Mr. Parker's theological position. He is a pure Theist, a disciple of the religion of Nature, and a denier of the possibility of any other religion. He is one of whom the disciples of Natural Religion may well be proud. We do not call him Theist in disparagement. Of course we do not think the less highly of him for his sincere convictions. It ought to be unnecessary to say this, though unbelief is so often regarded as irreligion. But the religion of Nature, as Parker holds it, is a noble religion. We gratefully accept and study its ever open book. We may doubt perhaps whether Theodore Parker has found in it all that he thinks he has. We may think he is more indebted indirectly to the miraculous and inspired in Christianity than he will allow. It is easy to find a star in the heavens when we have been shewn it first. But we take him on his own grounds and say that his Natural Religion is pure and noble. Our only possible disapproval of such a man in connection with his religious views, must be if he does not manfully, devoutly and consistently sustain the position which he has theoretically adopted. We therefore cannot understand why Mr. Parker should claim the name of Christianity as "most exceeding dear," any more than that of any other of the six religions. Nor can we see why he should have felt hurt at ceasing to find himself acceptable in avowedly Christian pulpits; or have expected Unitarian ministers always to attend his public lectures; or have regarded it as an "ecclesiastical, academical and personal insult" that the theological professors of the Cambridge Divinity School should have declined indorsing the invitation given by four of their pupils to Mr. Parker to deliver the customary address to them the Sunday before their graduation. Does any Unitarian minister think himself persecuted or insulted because his Independent or Baptist Trinitarian neighbour never asks him to exchange pulpits or preach his charity sermon? Does he expect all the Dissenting ministers to attend his lecture at a Mechanics' Institute? Would the theological faculty of the Independent College, St. John's Wood, have been considered guilty of "the greatest ecclesiastical, academical and personal insult in their professional power" to offer, if some of their young students had wished to be addressed by a Unitarian minister, and the request had been refused by the College authorities? We confess our surprise that Theodore Parker should querulously complain of these things, instead of taking his own position manfully. We do not of course undertake to vindicate all that he quotes as having been said of him and against him even by Unitarians; but we can no more vindicate what he has said of them (for certainly the hard and bitter sayings are not all on one side); and we think that if Mr. Parker, instead of

trying to insist upon Christian recognition while expressly denying a miraculous Christianity, had visibly acted out his own theology by proclaiming the Church of the Absolute Religion, not many hard things would or could have been said of him by Unitarians at least, who, generally speaking, do respect sincerity and consistency in every man, whether he believe more or less than themselves, or in whatever way he believe differently from them. But Parker has no patience with his best friends, because they do not all give up, at his call, the historical claims of miraculously revealed religion, to accept with him the *absolute*. He pities "the little Unitarian bark," which (as he thinks) "after many a venturous and profitable cruise, while in sight of port, the winds all fair, o'ermastered by its doubts and fears, reverses its course, and sails into dark, stormy seas, where no such craft can live" (p. 71). He sneers at the "liberal Christians," the "party of progress." He reproaches them for "their inconsistent and traditionary talk about 'Atonement,' 'Redeemer,' 'Salvation by Christ,' and their frequent resort to other pieces of damaged phraseology" (p. 68). The once "free and young and growing party (he says) became a sect, hide-bound, bridled with its creed, harnessed to an old, lumbering and crazy chariot, urged with sharp goads by near-sighted drivers, along the dusty and broken pavement of tradition, noisy and shouting, but going nowhere" (p. 68). He rebukes the Unitarians for lack of piety as well as lack of philosophy; and hard, rude vulgar words such as we have quoted fall from his pen continually respecting those of whom he yet says: "I count it a great good fortune that I was bred among religious Unitarians, and thereby escaped so much superstition." It seems quite absurd for such a man to sentimentalize on the hardship of exclusion from community of religious feeling with his quondam religious denomination, when his own convictions remove him quite as far from the power of sympathizing with the movements of their despised chariot or bark, as his departure removes his course from their theological co-operation. This whimpering after the theological sympathy of those towards whose theology he feels nothing but contemptuous pity, is almost beyond our power to realize, quite beyond our power to explain. Are we to take this as a proof that he is not much of a fighter after all, but a man of affection? No doubt affection has its vagaries, and it is at any rate "well dissembled" when the lover "kicks his beloved down stairs." But the sentimentality of early religious association ought not, at all events, to overcome the duty owing to truth. And no man, to all appearance, is more capable of self-reliance than Theodore Parker. It would be incomparably easier for him consistently to take his stand upon the Absolute Religion, than it was for Lindsey to renounce his Church and clerical sympathies. Nor can we imagine any explanation of his hurt feelings after shutting himself

out of the Unitarian Christian church, which would not vindicate F. D. Maurice, Jowett and many other unbelieving clergymen of the Church of England, in staying in that Church, notwithstanding all their doubts and denials of its doctrine. The true morality of belief is, to act out its convictions and take its natural consequences; and it seems to us a matter of simple necessity, and not a visitation of moral pains and penalties upon diversity of belief, that when Mr. Parker ceased to hold the central religious convictions and resulting feelings which once bound him to the Unitarian church and its ministers, the religious sympathy between him and them was modified accordingly. He records as an exceptional fact that his friendship with the Rev. James Freeman Clarke is unbroken, though their religious views widely differ; and we see no reason so likely to explain the implied rupture of a good many other friendships as the strong and rough speech in which Mr. P. himself indulges. But illness has already softened some of those asperities on both hands; and let us trust it will have more and more this effect, and that Theodore Parker may live to resume his work manfully among those who think and believe with him, while peacefully and gently towards those whom they think laggards in religious philosophy.

We have given our best attention, not now only, but on the appearance of Parker's *Discourse of Religion* many years ago, to his theory of the *Absolute Religion*, in the earnest desire of correctly appreciating his theological position. It is perfectly plain, from what has been already quoted, that he rejects altogether, as philosophically impossible, the idea of a supernatural or miraculous revelation, or of any inspiration except that which belongs to all men in all ages as an attribute of their nature. It is perfectly clear, too, that his own belief is a high and elevated one on the three great points enumerated in our first extract, namely, the infinite perfection of God, the moral faculty of man, and his immortality. These constitute with him the Absolute Religion, independent of all scriptures and creeds. On all these points he holds the most full and undoubting belief that even a Christian could express. The questions for him to settle with his readers are, *How* this Absolute Religion is *gained?* and *how it is proved?* And if we understand him rightly, the two questions have one answer: The Absolute Religion is instinctive, and therefore wants no proof. "It is the normal development, use, discipline and enjoyment of every part of the body and every faculty of the spirit; the direction of all natural powers to their natural purposes." It "begins in the instinctive feelings, and thence advances to reflective ideas, and assumes its ultimate form in the character of men, and so appears in their actions" (p. 50). It is called *Absolute* or *Natural* as if synonymously. Now if its advocate were content to say that man has by nature a faculty or sense of worship, a moral sense or conscience, and a faculty that

imagines and desires immortality, few persons perhaps would deny that these are essential parts of the human constitution. It might be more open to dispute whether these faculties should be described as having "*instinctive intuitions*" of God and Right and Immortality. The *faculty* may belong intrinsically to our nature, yet its *convictions* may not be intuitive or instinctive. We thankfully recognize the religious faculty, in its three aspects, as belonging to the very nature of man, and being therefore the basis of Natural Religion in all its varieties. But that this faculty *instinctively* or *intuitively* gains the three religious beliefs above named, we very much doubt. When we see with what variety the sense of God, of conscience and of immortality, is held by various nations and individuals, we are disposed to regard these varieties as referable rather to physical and social causes, than as consistent with the proper idea of instinct or intuition. And when we notice, throughout ancient and modern heathendom, the imperfection, the feebleness and the grossness, which by turns accompany and pervert, if they do not almost neutralize, the sense of the divine, the moral and the immortal, we must be allowed intirely to deny, what we understand Mr. Parker to assert, that these natural intuitions ascribe infinite perfection to the Deity, or exhibit anything beyond a very crude germ of conscience or immortality. And we are utterly at a loss to comprehend the propriety of calling this all-important but most rudimentary and gross Natural Religion by the high, pretentious title of the Absolute Religion. "What is in a name?" "A rose by any other name," &c., says the proverb. Logical ambiguities are in a name. Obscurity of thought lies hid in names. False pretensions are in names. In the common and definable sense of terms, the *Natural* Religion of mankind is anything but an *Absolute* Religion. It is the most vague, fluctuating, imperfect, impure and degrading mixture of great truths and almost as great fallacies, of natural aspirations and besetting doubt, error and sin. *Absolute* Religion! Why, all Natural Religion is *relative*, not absolute. It is all relative to country, age, climate, manners, institutions; relative also to the influences, direct or indirect, confessed or unconfessed, of Revealed Religion. Mr. Parker himself points out (in his *Discourse of Religion*) the grades of Natural Religion from Fetichism up to Philosophy; and we wonder that, while doing this, he should rank it all together as being or containing the Absolute Religion. It must be absolute in some other sense than that which would deny it to be relative. And, without levity or intended joke, we aver that its only claim to the title seems to us to consist in the absolutism of its professor.

We hesitate to ascribe to so thoughtful a writer the meaning which yet Mr. Parker's term *Absolute* Religion often *seems* to bear. We ask ourselves, Does he really aim at ascertaining what religion is *in itself*, as distinguished from the varying *conceptions*

of it by human minds? Does he search for the *absolute* as it really exists in the relations between God and man, and as absolutely known to the mind of God? Does he mean by the Absolute Religion that which is in itself the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth *of God?* We submit that this inquiry (which Mr. Parker often seems to us to be pursuing) is one which it is simply impossible for any human being to answer. He desires to conceive of religion apart from all human conceptions that limit or modify it,—*apart therefore from his own* human and necessarily imperfect conception. He must put himself in the place of God to pretend to this! He must be *infallible* in order to gain, and know that he has gained, the *absolute*. The moment any idea enters into a human mind, it is no longer absolute, but relative to that mind's powers and properties. When the wisest of us attempts to define what is the Absolute Religion, he only states his own individual conception of that absolute; he cannot in the nature of things do more. The Absolute Religion *as conceived by man* is absolute no longer. Religion, as variously conceived by man, may be defined of course as each man conceives it; or religion in its pure self, that is, the absolute nature and character of the Divine Being and the absolute position in which man stands towards Him, may be *reserved in the mind's conception as a separable thing* from what it knows or believes of religion in its own idea, or sees developed in that of others. We may also speak of this Absolute Religion, if we please, as a thing reserved from our actual reach,—as that which is in itself and is known to the all-knowing Intelligence, and that to which we desire that our own idea should be more and more conformed; but we can never safely affirm that our own highest and best idea of religion is actually conformable in all respects to the absolute nature of God and relations of man towards Him. Nay, rather, we are compelled by common humility to doubt whether, after our best efforts, it can be so. We can only hope, as our best dream of human perfectibility, that our idea may approach continually, and with it our conduct, more and more nearly to the Divine Idea and the Divine Will. This is only saying, in fact, that infallibility does not belong to the human mind. It is but recording the necessary condition of our knowledge.

Mr. Parker, following, we believe, in the steps of Kant, we must not say demonstrates, but infers rather, or perhaps more precisely *postulates*, the existence of a God in the following curious terms, to which we entreat the reader's careful attention:

"The existence of this religious element, of this sense of dependence, this sentiment of something without bounds, is itself a proof by implication of the existence of its object,—something on which dependence rests. A *belief in this relation* between the feeling in us and its object independent of us, comes *unavoidably* from the laws of man's nature. There is nothing of which we can be more certain. A natural want

in man's constitution *implies satisfaction in some quarter*, just as the faculty of seeing implies something to correspond to this faculty, namely, objects to be seen and a medium of light to see by. As the *tendency to love implies something lovely* for its object, so the religious sentiment implies its object. If it is regarded as a sense of absolute dependence, it implies the Absolute on which this dependence rests, independent of ourselves." *(Discourse of Matters pertaining to Religion*, b. i. ch. 2.)

By this short process, then, it is seriously proposed to settle the question of the existence of a God! The basis of religious argument is to be laid here. No more need of inductive proof from marks of design and benevolence, added to those of power, in the universe. No need even of the acute *à priori* attempt (which has been found, indeed, to involve a good deal of the *à posteriori* proof). The existence of the religious faculty in man proves at once the existence of its object, God. So the faculty of sight would prove the existence of light and visible objects to one who had been from birth in a cellar! So the faculty of loving would prove the existence of something lovely to a born slave who (to suppose a case) had never been permitted to receive kindness! Yes, truly; *on the assumption* that an *Infinite Wisdom has created all things*, we might argue that nothing can have been made in vain; that, therefore, as we have eyes there must be light, as we have ears there must be sound, and as we have a religious sense there must be God! But is not this the argument which logicians call *petitio principii?* You prove that Deity exists by assuming that *nothing exists without designed relation* to suitable objects. Is this philosophical? Is this rational? One only hesitates to charge upon names like those of Kant and Theodore Parker so childish a mistake as that of taking for granted the thing to be proved, and so of running round the vicious *circular syllogism* which proves nothing but the incompetence of the reasoner. But certainly the atheist (to whom, if to any one, the argument must be supposed to be addressed) would call it plainly what we have hinted. He would say, Of course, if you *assume* wise and benevolent arrangement to prevail throughout the universe, then every faculty in man must have its objects beyond himself. Of course, if you assume that "the existence of the religious element in man implies the existence of its object out of Him," then God is proved to exist because man can think he does. But I do not grant "that a belief in this relation between the feeling and its object comes unavoidably." It has never come to me. Reason with me if you will; but you must not assume the point of dispute between us in this absolute fashion.

Plainly, the atheistic controversy is left untouched by the proposed proof. We can only wonder how theists can feel their own theism to rest soundly on such an assumption. For ourselves, theists through the investigation of the works of creation

ways of Providence,—the investigation prompted, of
y the religious faculty and craving, and leading on to
supplies of faith and hope,—we cannot let go our old
proofs on the invitation of an argument that professes
profoundly simple, yet turns out so transparently falla-
investigation. We must still hold to Derham and Paley,
equally good or better book of similar character; and
tionally inferred that the Great Object exists for whom
ious sense yearns, we may then indeed reasonably hope
t and infer that every other faculty of our nature has
urpose and blessing. That the faculty of sight implies
need not, indeed, argue, as our eyes have experience of
hat hearing implies sound; nor that the stomach implies
the feet a solid earth to walk upon; because happily
rience in each case shews both the faculty and the pro-
ade for its use. But there are grave occasions in our
nich some natural faculty or power or desire, bodily or
seems destitute of, or but inadequately provided with,
urces to which it seems to point somewhere beyond our-
nd then we may indeed welcome, as a legitimate and
nference from the perceived harmonies and bounties of
ne economy, the devout trust that these seemingly desti-
rers and seemingly futile cravings have their purpose
will be satisfied or vindicated in the great result.

CRIPT. We do not willingly qualify the unreserved ad-
above expressed for Mr. Parker's anti-slavery efforts;
ed, our painful reference now is to his most recent say-
the subject, which we still believe are unparalleled by
essions that he ever used before.
ter from him to an anti-slavery friend in Boston, dated
Nov. 25th, after hearing of John Brown's conviction and
, has been published in the New York *National Anti-Standard* of Jan. 7th. Its expressions are, of course,
nd unmistakeable; its spirit is, of course, resolute, bold
re; but at the same time, we must think, reckless and
nd in the interests of humanity we must doubt whether
nsel as he now gives bespeaks the wise friend of the

e brief propositions he lays it down as the natural right
of the slave to kill those who interfere with his liberty,
ny and all other true men to help him to do so. He
oped that American democracy would be engrossed in
ly ink (than blood); but it is plain now that our pil-
must lead through a Red Sea, wherein Pharoah will go
nd perish." He anticipates other similar attempts to
, with apparent satisfaction: "Nine out of ten will
tenth will succeed." "You and I prefer the peaceful

method; but I, at least, shall welcome the violent if no other accomplish the end."

Not every Christian abolitionist has nerve to anticipate, and by expressing his anticipations ***virtually to promote and advise,*** a servile war in America. We wonder how Theodore Parker has the heart to contemplate it except as an awful calamity, likely enough indeed, but to be deprecated and if possible averted by the wisdom and patience of the abolitionists.

THE HARMONY OF THE SPHERES.

(FROM THE GERMAN OF PFEIFFELL.)

A YOUTH by chance in Plato read
That music by the spheres was made:
"This concert must I hear," he cried,
And straight to Jove his wish referred.
To grant that wish the god denied:
"Young fool, the concert of the spheres
May not be heard by mortal ears."
Unchanged remained the youthful will,
He sought, implored, petitioned still;
Till Jove at length his patience lost,
Revoked his first ungracious word,
And touched his ear. The stripling heard,
And what? A frightful tumult burst.
A thousand, thousand voicèd song
Peal dread and deep the heavens along;
Rattled and groaned a noise of war,
And horror wild and falling far!
O! all the thunders ever hurled
By the Avenger on the world
Were but the hum of bees at play
To this tremendous roundelay.
"Great Jove, what sounds are these I hear?"
The youth exclaimed, o'ercome with fear;
"Is this the heavenly harmony?
So roars all hell around its prey;
Nay, deafened let me rather be,
Thou fearful god of all the gods."
Jove answered from the thunder-clouds,
"Know, feeble childing of a star,
That men not gods but mortals are;
Thou hear'st a tumult rend the skies,
And *I* the heavenly harmonies!"

Rochdale, Jan. 13, 1860. S. F. MACDONALD.

MR. MEANS ON THE NATIONAL REVIEWER AND THE RESURRECTION.

SIR,

UNLESS the "Unitarian Minister" and the "Unitarian Layman" (whose prior claim, as the original critics of the *National Reviewer*, to be heard on this subject of the resurrection all must admit) so far occupy your pages as to leave no room for others, I venture to ask admission for a few remarks, springing from a deep conviction of the importance of the question both in itself and in its results, tempered by sincere admiration and regard for the excellent man on whose sentiments I am about to animadvert.

I understand the reviewer's hypothesis of the resurrection to be this:—that the existence of Jesus after death was, in some miraculous way, made manifest to his disciples, but not, as stated in the Gospels, by their becoming cognizant through their senses of his re-animated body; that this spiritual cognizance of his being alive is recorded by Paul, whose writings are the earliest extant testimony on the subject; that "in the reports handed down by tradition and misapprehended by the grosser mind of the multitude, these spiritual manifestations gradually assumed the form of bodily appearances," and that it is in this form they are recorded in the gospel narratives; that the belief of the ascension grew up as "a necessary complement" to the belief of a bodily resurrection; and, finally, that the Gospels, in their present form, cannot be traced to an earlier time than the second half of the second century, "though their substantial materials are an authentic representation of the belief of the apostolic age."

I have advisedly termed this view an hypothesis: for this word, as I judge, describes its true character, and that character constitutes a strong presumption against it. We are discussing a question of fact, recorded in several books of the New Testament, and we have presented to us a supposition as to what it was, in support of which there is not one tittle of positive evidence. I am aware that this assertion may appear presumptuous in the face of the reviewer's appeal to Paul, but I am not the less convinced that it is true.

But let us ask why Paul should be the first writer appealed to, as the reviewer contends, in preference to the authors of the Gospels. He does not write historically, he does not narrate events, but in the course of his argument refers to them as being already known to his readers. He appeals (1 Cor. xv. 3, 4) to their previous knowledge, and recalls, very briefly and summarily, what they knew. It is not, surely, from such a reference to things already known and recognized that we should "take our point of departure in this question," but from some fuller account

of the facts of the case, in order that we too may have that previous knowledge which Paul presumes in those to whom he was writing: and since the Gospels contain, as the reviewer admits, "an authentic representation of the belief of the apostolic age," we should rather resort to them in the first instance. It is surely more reasonable to interpret the brief reference by the fuller statement, than to reject or distort this because it differs from our interpretation of the briefer and less distinct reference. So that even if the reviewer's denial of the early origin of the Gospels be admitted, it does not follow that his preference of Paul's authority in this question is right. But leaving for the present the question of the date of the Gospels, and conceding Paul's claim to a prior hearing, let us see what he says.

He says that Christ "was seen." In the original, as in our version, the term used ordinarily expresses a sensible perception. The Greek ὤφθη is cognate with the word ὄμματα, "eyes." So that the most natural interpretation of Paul's words is, that the manifestation was to the sense of sight. Nor is there anything against this. Paul gives no countenance to the reviewer's interpretation; there is not the slightest hint that the manifestation was "spiritual." It is quite true, as the reviewer states, "that he puts his own seeing of Christ on the same level with that of the other apostles;" and "that he must have known from tradition whether they had conversed with a body or not." But this argument leads to a conclusion diametrically opposite to the reviewer's; for the earliest, indeed the only account we have of the appearances to them, viz., those in the Gospels, distinctly speak of a corporeal manifestation. If, then, Paul's seeing of Christ was like theirs, it was corporeal too; a conclusion to which the word ὤφθη, used by Paul, has already led us. There is yet another consideration. Paul's words are, "I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures" (ver. 3, 4). Here are three things predicated of one subject in one sentence: he died, was buried, rose again: of these the burial is predicated of the body only; where, then, would be the propriety of its mention here, if the other terms denote simply a spiritual change? Where is the sequence or connection of incidents which affect, some only the body, and others only the soul?

The reviewer's appeal to Paul's testimony thus breaks down; and as Paul is his only witness, I am borne out in characterizing his view of the resurrection as a mere hypothesis or supposition: and the supposition of one, however eminent, living eighteen centuries after the event, and with no other sources of information than are open to us all, cannot for a moment weigh against contemporary, or nearly contemporary, evidence.

I pass on to the testimony of the four Gospels. I shall not here assume, what is, nevertheless, my firm belief, that they are the works of the writers whose names they bear, but will concede what the reviewer states, that none of them, in their actual form, can be proved to have been written anterior to the destruction of Jerusalem, or even the middle of the second century. I am not sure, however, whether I correctly interpret what the reviewer says of them, for his statements are not clear. "In Matthew," he tells us, "we have probably the original Palestinian tradition respecting Jesus." Mark's place he leaves undetermined. Between Matthew and Luke "there is a wide and perceptible difference, which implies the occurrence of a considerable interval of time." "The difference between John and any one of the three earlier Gospels is so marked, that it is hardly possible it should have been written till towards the end of the first century." Some of these statements are disputable enough, but I do not now stop to dispute them. I gather that he regards Matthew's as the earliest, and John's as the latest of the Gospels; and he seems to admit that they all four belong to the first century. As, however, he elsewhere says that they cannot be traced "in their present form" earlier than "the second half of the second century," he supposes, I presume, that they underwent some modification or corruption between the close of the first and the middle of the second century, though they still present "an authentic representation of the belief of the apostolic age." This is enough for me. Whether he admits that the Gospels were originally the works of their reputed authors, he does not say, and I shall not assume it; it is enough for us to take them as representing the general belief of the church at the close of the first century, or, if the reviewer requires it, in the middle of the second.

That belief was in a bodily resurrection, and in manifestations of it to the senses of sight, hearing and touch: we find it in all the Gospels and running through the whole narrative of the resurrection, in such a way that we cannot regard it as one of the later "elements of belief" by which the purity of apostolic tradition was contaminated, for its introduction must have involved a dissolution and reconstruction of the general belief. Let us see this. Beside the seeing and hearing of Jesus (and his words, let me observe, are conversational, often argumentative, being replies to objections or solutions of difficulties), the women held him by the feet (Matt. xxviii. 9); he sat down to meat with the disciples at Emmaus, and took bread and brake and gave to them; he shewed to the apostles his hands and his feet, took a piece of a broiled fish and of an honeycomb, and did eat it before them (Luke xxiv. 30, 40—43); pointed out to them that his hands were marked with the print of the nails, and his side torn with the spear; called them to dine, and dined with them, taking bread and fish and giving to them (John xx. 20, 27; xxi. 12, 13). Eliminate

from the narrative these particulars and all that must go with them, and what shall we have left?

But not only do the Gospels contain these particulars, but they represent Christ himself as arguing from them. When the disciples took him for a spirit, he said to them, "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have" (Luke xxiv. 39). And again, he said, to the unbelieving Thomas, "Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing" (John xx. 27). Truly, Sir, if it were not that we could ill spare so excellent a man as the reviewer, I could wish that he had been then living and present to profit by so complete a refutation of his views.

This remonstrance of Christ suggests another argument against regarding the belief in the corporeal resurrection of Christ as a corruption of the earlier and purer tradition. Such corruption, had it taken place, would have naturally tended to conformity with the prevalent belief in disembodied spirits, which were then, as now, looked upon, inconsistently enough, as only semi-material; cognizable indeed by sight and hearing, but not by the grosser sense of touch. But the gospel narratives overpass the popular belief, and exceed it as far as the reviewer's hypothesis falls short of it. Nay, more than that, they distinctly contend against and refute it; so that we must suppose that not only was the earlier and purer belief corrupted by the growth of these corporeal views, but that the sacred records, and even the words of Christ himself, were interpolated or perverted to support the corruption.

I confess I am surprised at the plastic character which the reviewer and others ascribe to the faith of the first age. How astounding the change in the century from A.D. 50 to A.D. 150, and yet how silent, general and unopposed; a change, too, brought about not by the silent, almost unconscious, dropping of outworn dogmas, but by the incorporation in their belief, and that without evidence, of new particulars relating to outward things, tangible by human sense, the change into a material form of a purely spiritual occurrence which all born in the church must have known from childhood. For the resurrection of Christ was not a trivial incident little regarded, but a great central fact, without which, as the reviewer admits, the moral and spiritual power of the gospel is unaccountable.

And the documents, too, how plastic were they! The Church's records of the Saviour's life and words, and of the labours of apostles, received, so far as we can learn, without resistance or remonstrance, any new form which the ever-growing belief of the time might require; miracles were inserted, or (as in the present instance) invested with an altogether different character; the

earlier copies, precious from their age and, we may suppose, sacred from their authorship as well as their subject, were laid aside and left to disappear, not only from existence, but even from memory. Christ himself, on this supposition, was made, as we have seen, to argue for a view of his resurrection which was not thought of till many years after; and the discourses of Peter at Pentecost (Acts ii. 31) and to Cornelius (x. 41), and of Paul at Antioch of Pisidia (xiii. 34—37), were all invented or corrupted, so as to make them accord with the error of a later time. And for what are we to resort to the belief of this astounding and incredible pliableness of early faith and early records? To enable us to receive some new hypothesis, sprung from the teeming invention of this nineteenth century. We are in this case to set aside all the evidence of the New Testament, and believe in a new miracle on which it is silent.

The difficulty of admitting the possibility of these astounding changes is increased by the consideration that the churches were scattered and mutually independent communities, not forming so compact a body as afterwards, when the hierarchy had completed its organization and established its power. The churches in Syria, Asia Minor, Greece, Italy, communities gathered from among nations of different character and different language, to meet whose spiritual wants versions of the Scripture in their vernacular tongue were, if not yet provided, felt to be needed—all accepted silently and submissively the conversion from a spiritual to a corporeal form of the most influential of their convictions, and that at a time when their faith was at its greatest intensity and effectiveness.

The reviewer speaks (p. 45) of the vague, dim and visionary character of the resurrection. I presume he means of the narrative. To me it seems these terms are singularly inappropriate; for the accounts are surely remarkably distinct and clear. Let me apply a test. Would the most unimaginative painter be at a loss in representing any of the scenes of the resurrection; and would not the most imaginative be restrained by the fulness and distinctness of the narrative? Had Raphael any greater difficulty or greater freedom in painting Christ's charge to Peter than in his other cartoons? Yet it represents one of the scenes of the resurrection. The truth is, that the accounts are not dim and vague, but abrupt and fragmentary; and the very difficulties which the reviewer seems to feel are owing to this. They arise less from what is told than from what is not told. How Jesus came and went, where he was and what he did in the intervals between the scenes recorded in the narrative,—these are the difficulties; and they relate to things about which the history is silent. The reviewer is indeed perplexed that the disciples on the road to Emmaus did not recognize Christ; and his perplexity would be reasonable, were not his supposition that "the marks

on his hands and feet were conspicuous," gratuitous: coverings for the feet were in common use, and the hands might easily be hidden in the ample folds of an oriental garment; and if these marks were hidden, it was not marvellous that the disciples should fail to recognize one whom they knew to have died, whom certainly they did not expect to meet there and then, and who assumed the address and manner of a perfect stranger. So with the phrase, "he vanished out of their sight," or rather, "he disappeared (ἄφαντος ἐγένετο) from them," the whole difficulty arises from our translators having unwisely used the ghost-like word "vanished." When the disciples recovered from their joyful surprise on recognizing Jesus, he was gone. They saw him not: that they have told us. How and where he went they have not told us, for they did not know. Again, it is felt by the reviewer and by one of his critics that it is incredible that Jesus should have been forty days in Galilee, and should not have been seen by any but believers. On all recorded occasions none but believers appear to have been there, and of other times the history is silent; but I cannot see that there would have been any great difficulty in a man escaping recognition whose death was well known to all, but whose resurrection was not yet proclaimed abroad or even rumoured, and who desired to conceal himself.

In truth, the very abruptness and consequent difficulty of the narrative bespeak, to me, both its early origin and its uncorruptness. The narrative is abrupt, because the appearances it records were so. What the authors knew they recorded; what they knew not they did not attempt to supply from any inventive stores of their own; and imagination, elsewhere so busy, was restrained by reverence from tampering with these sacred records, notwithstanding the temptation which their obvious gaps presented.

There are two particulars in the narrative of the resurrection which necessarily imply that it was bodily, and which must have been included in the original belief,—the empty tomb, and the third day. The empty tomb lies at the foundation of the whole account. This first draws attention, occasions perplexity, excites hope. The whole belief of the resurrection was built first on this, as the belief of the resurrection was itself the corner-stone of the church. All the Gospels mention it and the surprise which it occasioned; the unbelieving Jews admitted it, and accounted for it by a tradition which was still current when Matthew's Gospel took its present form (Matt. xxviii. 15). This, then, at any rate, is a fact. Yet what but a bodily resurrection could have left the tomb empty? Ewald's supposition that some of the disciples removed the body from reverence for their Master, is childish and absurd in the extreme. The disciples at large knew nothing of such a removal; those in whose care the body was, the affectionate women, knew nothing of it, for they

were baffled by it in their purpose of completing their offices of love. If removed from reverence, the place where it was carried to would have been known and cherished. I repeat it, that nothing but a bodily resurrection could have left an empty tomb; and that this was left was admitted from the first.

So too with the fixing of the resurrection to the third day. Christ himself foretold it again and again; the evangelists recorded it; the apostles proclaimed it. But how could evangelists or apostles or any mortals know the time of the spirit's unseen transition to another state? Observe that the passages all speak of Christ's resurrection, not of his manifestation to his disciples. That, indeed, was on the third day, but it is not that of which the predictions or the records speak. It is, "the Son of Man shall rise again," or "Christ rose again on the third day." And this rising on the third day is mentioned by Paul in the passage (1 Cor. xv. 4) quoted by the reviewer; and thus, again, the belief of this chosen witness is identified with that of other Christians as a belief in a bodily resurrection.

I have not spoken of the ascension, but my argument includes it. I agree with the reviewer that it is the necessary complement of a bodily resurrection; I cannot, therefore, "throw it overboard," nor do I wish to do so.

Apologizing for this intrusion on your patience, and again expressing my very hearty respect for the reviewer, while dealing thus freely with his views, I am, &c.,

JOSEPH CALROW MEANS.

Grove Street, South Hackney, Jan. 7, 1860.

REV. S. BACHE ON THE ARTICLE IN THE NATIONAL REVIEW.

SIR,

IF the controversy which has been carried on in your pages by "the Author of the Article in the National" and others were of a personal character, I should feel it to be both unjust and impertinent in me to intermeddle with it; but the facts on which it all turns appear to me of such infinite moment, that I cannot consent to remit them to the region of what may be called, for distinction's sake, a philosophical or metaphysical, as opposed to an historical theology, without recording my decided, though personally most respectful, protest against the views which have been advanced respecting them, and the arguments or suggestions by which an attempt is made to weaken, if not destroy, the direct testimony of the Gospels to their reality.

Permit me also to record *in limine* my entire sympathy with the author of the article in the National, in the "common result" which he so touchingly delineates (p. 47) as that of his own

personal experience; and to assure him and your readers in general that nothing but a deep and ever-increasing conviction of the obligation to maintain what we deem important truth, though ever in the spirit of love, would induce me to stand forth in even seeming opposition to one towards whom it is impossible for any one who knows him to feel otherwise than the most cordial respect and affection, and under whose censure, as guilty of "the folly of bigotry and the presumption of dogmatism" (p. 47), I am individually most reluctant to risk falling. But by my very profession I am bound to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints" (Jude 3); and I trust that I shall not be unmindful of the equally powerful obligation to contend "lawfully," and in a spirit worthy of its sacred character.

I have read with attention this remarkable controversy, and find myself at issue with the National Reviewer, not merely in regard to the views at which he arrives, but in his very mode of arriving at them. That mode, as I understand it, is as follows: (I abridge the statements in pp. 44, 45)—Paul's is the oldest testimony to the resurrection of Christ: we must therefore take our departure from his statements, and construct [query, *construe?*] from his point of view the statements of the Gospels. Now Paul puts his own seeing of Christ on the same level as that of the other apostles—ὤφθη. Hence these "manifestations of the risen Jesus were real and of a living presence, but not conveyed through the outward sense." When Docetic errors began to prevail, Christians unconsciously interpreted the traditional accounts of these spiritual manifestations in a more outward and corporeal sense, "doctrinal reaction aiding the development of the idea of a bodily resurrection."

1. On this argument I have first to remark, that I do not understand how the word ὤφθη in this connection comes to mean "manifestations not conveyed through the outward sense." The facts just before mentioned (1 Cor. xv. 3, 4) are, that Christ died and was buried and rose again the third day, and then was seen (ὤφθη) by Cephas, &c. Are not all these facts narrated as alike discernible, and actually discerned, through the senses? Does Paul give us any intimation that some of them were so discerned and others not? And does the National Reviewer admit Paul's repeated narrative of his own conversion, as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, to be historically true; and, if so, will he contend that the incidents there narrated were "manifestations not conveyed through the outward sense"? The argument on this point seems to me to break down altogether.

2. But even were it capable of being established, I must still protest, and with yet greater earnestness, against explaining the statements of the Gospels by this assumption. For observe its real character. The risen Saviour manifests himself to Paul *after* his own ascension, and therefore confessedly when no longer

encompassed with a mortal body. Therefore even *before* his ascension he manifests himself in the same way to his apostles. Such is the assumption of the National Reviewer. True, the Gospels tell a very different story; but then "we find no distinct allusion to any of them by name before the second half of the second century" (p. 43). Why is this circumstance alleged? For the purpose of explaining how the traditional accounts of Christ's spiritual intercourse with his disciples after his death became hardened into statements of his actual bodily appearance. The same process must necessarily be applied also to the history of the Acts of the Apostles; and Peter's declaration in the very passage commented on by the National Reviewer (Acts x. 41), "Even to us who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead," must be eliminated on the very same principle.

On this argument I have three remarks to make:—1. That it appears to me highly improbable, in the very nature of things, that we *should* find any distinct allusion to any of the Gospels *by name* at an earlier period, and that the fact of our finding it at that period implies not merely the existence, but the general and reverential recognition, of these Gospels, in preference to many others which were rejected as less worthy of credit, *for a very long antecedent period.* (See this argument clearly stated and established in Norton's Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels, Vol. I. p. 122, seq. London, 1847.) 2. That if objection be taken to the history of Christ's *resurrection* on this ground, the same objection may be taken to the entire history; in consistency, I think it *must* be taken; and then, with the Docetæ, we change the whole earthly life of Christ into a phantom, or reject the evangelical histories of it altogether. 3. That if the body of Jesus were not raised and re-animated and miraculously removed from this earth, its detection was, under the circumstances, inevitable, and his doctrine would then have perished with him.*

3. All sound philosophy must be based on the patient investigation and clear discovery of *facts;* inasmuch as it consists in ascertaining not what God *might* do (for this is infinitely beyond our comprehension), but what he has *actually done.* Now no Christian can doubt for a moment the possibility of "the direct communication of spiritual truth to our human consciousness" (p. 40), inasmuch as such truth was actually communicated to

* See Miall's Bases of Belief (p. 266), for reasoning on this subject which is to my mind conclusive, and which I have certainly never seen answered. Anything more absurd than Ewald's perfectly gratuitous assumption (quoted in Christian Reformer, 1859, p. 578), I think I have never read in my life. The ascension being "the necessary sequel" (p. 45) of the resurrection, and being, from its very nature, the affair of comparatively a few moments,—being farther confirmed by the gift of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost,—neither required nor admitted narrative details so minute and continuous as we have of the resurrection.

the consciousness of Christ. But, if we may believe the gospel histories, it was accompanied with such *attestations* of its divine origin and character as not only warranted Jesus himself in claiming to be "a teacher come from God," but as required others reverently to acknowledge that claim. Take away these *credentials*, and I think it will be impossible to shew that Jesus might not have been himself deceived. If you allege that the integrity and purity of his life are the all-sufficient attestations to the contrary, what will you make, I ask, of the visions and revelations of Baron Swedenborg, and why do you not believe in them? For myself, I understand the conviction avowed by Nicodemus on the ground on which he has placed it (John iii. 2); take away that ground, and it appears to me that you take away all rational conviction along with it.

4. The National Reviewer calls it (p. 34) "a great mistake to treat Christianity so entirely as an isolated event—a fact *sui generis*—in the course of human affairs." Unless there be an extraordinary emphasis on the words "so entirely" which would make them imply that Christianity in conjunction with Judaism is *not at all* recognized as a part of the great plan of Providence for the education of our race, I would ask, Is it *not*, then, "a fact *sui generis*"? If not, what other fact of the same kind can you adduce? We have no *such* revelation anywhere else, have we? If we have, where?

5. I do not hesitate to avow myself one of those who feel that what are called the *natural* arguments for a future life, derive all their power from the special confirmation afforded by the gospel. *With* that confirmation, they are to my mind irresistible; *without* it (as I have again and again felt when looking on the lifeless remains of the beloved departed), they would give me *no confidence whatever*. The physical difficulty would have proved insurmountable to me; the sight of the stiff, cold corpse would have outweighed ten thousand philosophical arguments and chilled my warmest aspirations. And that it actually *did* so in ancient times with even the most enlightened and philosophic-minded men, see Servius Sulpicius' letter of consolation to Cicero on the death of Tullia, and how Cicero accepts the miserable consolation as the *only* consolation which it was possible for him to receive. (Ad Diversos, iv. 5, 6.) See also Kenrick's Roman Sepulcral Inscriptions. "Upon the whole (writes this learned and discriminating author), the evidence, negative even more than positive, of the Roman sepulcral inscriptions, abundantly confirms the testimony of heathen as well as Christian writers, to the absence of any definite and practical belief in a future state, in the three or four first centuries after the Christian æra" (p. 56). See also Dr. Ephraim Peabody's Christian Days and Thoughts, from which the following quotation is given in the Christian Reformer for 1859, p. 245:

"Christianity met that fact [of universal death] by the only evidence with which it could be met—it met the *skepticism* of the senses by an *evidence addressed to the senses*,—by the resurrection from the dead. We talk of spirituality, as if it did not need this visible evidence. Let us thank God that He is more merciful than our folly asks. Somehow, here, our souls are connected with the body; and high as we may soar in faith, the highest flight must start from the earth. And God has given just the evidence we need for the immortal life, in the resurrection of Christ."

For myself, therefore, I entirely adopt the sentiment of the apostle (1 Cor. xv. 57), without any qualification whatever, "Thanks be to God who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." I gratefully own that if the victory be mine at all, it is "through our Lord Jesus Christ," and through no other agency whatever. Believing that because he lives we shall live also, I am enabled correctly to appreciate those internal spiritual evidences of my immortal destiny which, in the light of his gospel and resurrection, approve themselves as of inestimable value, but which, without such light, I might perhaps never have seen at all.

And living as we do, thank God! in the full effulgence of this Sun of righteousness, I can well understand how many Christians of a philosophical turn of mind may occasionally forget (especially when philosophizing) where their daylight really comes from; and so they give the preference to the dim spiritual insight afforded by nature above the clear revelation of divine truth. In this they do but imitate the wisdom of the memorable sage who is said to have pronounced the moon more useful to us than the sun; "because (said he) the moon often gives us light in the night when it would be dark without her; whereas the sun shines only in the daytime when we don't want him at all." In many of our chiefest blessings, we have to overcome the blinding influence of habit before we are able to discern their true source.

I have been carried on by my deep interest in this subject to a much greater length than I at first intended, though I have only noted down some leading points of the argument, and briefly intimated my views respecting each point. I have endeavoured to treat the great question entirely on its own merits; and I shall be the first to regret if I have suffered any expression to escape me which is offensive to those from whom I cannot help widely differing in opinion, but for whom personally, notwithstanding such difference, I have the most sincere and cordial respect. Clear and strong as are my convictions, I trust that I am not inaccessible to correction wherever I may be in error; and I have the most perfect and unwavering confidence in the supreme value of truth as truth, be it what and where it may:

only should I ever find that it is *not* in the Gospels, I shall lose no time in endeavouring to correct the mistake of my life by exposing the fallacies by which I have been misled. At present, however, it is without doubt or distrust, and with the full consent of my judgment and feelings, that I authenticate the foregoing views as my own, by subscribing myself, Sir, respectfully yours,

SAMUEL BACHE..

Edgbaston, January 30, 1860.

LIFE AND LETTERS OF SCHLEIERMACHER.*

AFTER the lapse of a full quarter of a century since his death, the personal history of the great Berlin theologian has at length been given to the public, in a form which, however it may satisfy his surviving friends and admirers as a faithful picture of his life, will scarcely, we may expect, attract any large circle of readers in this country. The work is, indeed, on several accounts, sufficiently interesting. It discloses much of the mental growth and character of one who was long the leading religious philosopher, not of a small sect, but of a great people, himself conspicuous among the most eminent of his contemporaries. It exhibits also the deep, affectionate and religious nature of the man, shewing us how strongly he attached to him his personal friends, and how closely he clung to them as necessary to his existence. Yet many of these are persons now little known or cared for; the circumstances which connected Schleiermacher with them are often too slightly, or not at all, explained in these pages; and altogether there is a preponderance of mere feeling and sentimentality, and a want of outward incident and action, in the work, private and public, which must tend to prevent it from reaching any but the comparative few who may already be somewhat familiar with the works and influence of this distinguished man.

It is one of the features now alluded to, that there is so little of reference in the work to the hurricane of exciting political events which swept over Europe during the first thirty-six years of Schleiermacher's life (which period, comprised in the first volume, the present article more especially includes). Connected though he was with public persons, and even, indirectly, with one of the leading governments of the day, he might almost have been the inhabitant of another planet, for anything that appears in his letters on such topics. We do not know whether there has been any intentional suppression, or whether the blank be

* The Life of Schleiermacher, as unfolded in his Autobiography and Letters. Translated from the German by Frederica Rowan. 2 vols. London—Smith, Elder and Co.

only a natural result of the political system in which he grew up, but the omission is great and obvious. Schleiermacher would seem to have been too entirely absorbed in his own thoughts and feelings, in the pleasant society of his Berlin friends, especially those of the gentler sex, in his sermons, his Plato, and so on, to have had a thought or a word for such purely extraneous matters. Happy the man who thus, from Olympian heights of philosophy and literature, can look so calmly down upon a convulsed and tottering world! But this sort of isolation or indifference (or what shall we call it?) does not add to the interest of his letters or his life, to the readers of a new generation and a distant country.

It is, however, at the same time fair to remember that the work does not profess to give any full account of Schleiermacher's public life. The translator observes that she "undertook to introduce to the English reader the *man* Schleiermacher, not the theologian,"—"the man and his private life," as portrayed in these letters. Let us also be careful not to do an injustice. The foregoing remark relates strictly to the period above mentioned. We shall find that, later in his life, the theologian manifested no small amount of patriotic zeal and energy; but it would seem to have required even the fatal year of Jena and its consequences to rouse him, so far, at least, as we can gather from the letters before us.

After all, it is a venial fault that a man keeps closely to what he feels to be his proper vocation, and becomes wholly absorbed in its duties; and, with all drawbacks of the kind mentioned, we have read this work with interest and profit. The development of such a mind as Schleiermacher's will always afford a worthy subject of study; while the glimpses here given of an age now passed away, and of persons some of whose names are still famous among us—Kant, Fichte, the Schlegels, Tieck, Schelling, Jean Paul—are additional sources of attraction. We propose, in this and another article, to give our readers some account of the contents of these volumes—simply of these volumes, i.e. of the leading incidents of Schleiermacher's life as here presented; for of his religious philosophy and the kindred subjects, or generally of his works, or his influence as a writer and teacher, we cannot undertake to speak at all minutely. Such a task would far exceed the limits of our space and time, even were other requisites for the work fully at our command.

Schleiermacher's father was a chaplain in the Prussian army, and at the time of his son's birth, November 21, 1768, was stationed at Breslau, in Silesia. The boy soon proved himself intelligent and precocious, going to school at five years of age, and distancing older competitors in Latin and other subjects. The account of these early years appears partly in letters of his parents, and partly in an autobiographical sketch written by himself for the ecclesiastical authorities, when a candidate for ordination as a

preacher. This sketch is too brief to be in itself of great interest, but it throws light on the letters which follow it. In due time, after some years of the ordinary school instruction, the boy is sent, with his younger brother, to the establishment of the Moravian Brethren at Niesky, in Prussian Lusatia, some distance north-east of Bautzen. Here, and afterwards in the college of the Brethren at Barby, he pursues his studies evidently with great care and success, but ever under the influence of the religious doctrines of his teachers. The high orthodox tone of his earlier letters, as well as of those of his parents, will strike every reader. These letters reveal to us the close and affectionate union existing between the members of a pious family; but it is not until we come to the point where Schleiermacher finds himself compelled to give up some of the religious doctrines in which he has been educated, that we meet with matter of more than ordinary interest. We see, too, in the case of both Schleiermacher and his sister Charlotte, something of the interior life of the Moravian institutions. What we learn is neither very complete nor very prepossessing. The good Brethren seem to have gone on the plan of shutting out the light, and of putting down doubts and false doctrine by a careful discharge of the routine duties of their position,—a course for which the authority of great names in our own country might be cited. The young inquirer could obtain no help from them in his doubts and difficulties; in fact, he is soon made to understand that his only course is to quit the establishment.

The change referred to is in every way a remarkable one, in a youth of eighteen brought up as Schleiermacher had been, and discloses in him great independence and strength of character. He thus makes his disbelief known to his father, under date of Jan. 21, 1787:

"I confessed to you, in my last letter, my dissatisfaction with the limited scope of my position here, and pointed out how easily, under such circumstances, religious doubts may, in our times, arise among young people. I thus endeavoured to prepare you for the intelligence that these doubts have been awakened in me, but I did not attain my object. You believed that your answer had set me at rest; and for six whole months I most unjustifiably remained silent, because I could not find it in my heart to destroy this illusion.

"Faith is the regalia of the Godhead, you say. Alas! dearest father, if you believe that, without this faith, no one can attain to salvation in the next world, nor to tranquillity in this—and such, I know, is your belief—oh! then, pray to God to grant it to me, for to me it is now lost. I cannot believe that He, who called Himself the Son of Man, was the true, eternal God: I cannot believe that His death was a vicarious atonement, because He never expressly said so Himself; and I cannot believe it to have been necessary, because God, who evidently did not create men for perfection, but for the pursuit of it, cannot possibly intend to punish them eternally, because they have not attained it.

"Alas! best of fathers, the deep and acute suffering which I endure while writing this letter, prevents me from giving you in detail the history of my soul as regards my opinions, or all my strong reasons for entertaining them; but I implore you, do not look upon them as merely transient views, without deep roots. During almost a whole year they have had a hold upon me, and it is long and earnest reflection that has determined me to adopt them. I entreat you not to keep back from me your strongest counter-reasons; but I candidly confess that I do not think you will succeed in convincing me *at present*, for I hold firmly by my convictions."—I. 46, 47.

The distress of the poor father on receiving this communication is terrible. He thus replies, anger and disappointment, religious zeal and fatherly affection, alternating throughout a long letter:

"Oh, thou insensate son! who has deluded thee, that thou no longer obeyest the truth, thou, before whose eyes Christ was pictured, and who now crucifiest him? You were so well started, who has held you back from obeying the truth? Such persuasion is not from Him who has called you; but a little leaven leavens the whole loaf. The same wickedness of heart which, four years ago, made you fear that through it you would be lost in the world, and which drove you into the congregation, alas! you have furthermore nourished in yourself, and it has now leavened your whole being, and is driving you out of the congregation. Oh! my son—my son! How deeply do you humble me! What sighs you call forth from my soul! And if the departed watch over us, oh! what a cruel disturber of the tranquillity of your blessed mother have you become, now that even your stranger stepmother is weeping over you." I. 50.

Again, in the same letter:

"And now, O son, whom I press with tears to my sorrowful heart! with heartrending grief I discard thee, for discard thee I must, as thou no longer worshippest the God of thy fathers, as thou no longer kneelest at the same altar with him—yet, once more, my son, before we part—oh! tell me, what has the poor, meek, and humble-hearted Jesus done to thee, that thou renouncest his strength and his divine peace? Did you find no consolation when you laid before Him your need, the anguish of your heart? And now, in return for the divine long-suffering and patience with which He listened to you, you deny Him? You break the promise which you so often pronounced: with Thee Jesus I will abide? Why wouldst thou leave Him?—hast thou never received the word of life from Him?"—I. 52.

The letters which pass between Schleiermacher and his father at this period are affecting. The affliction of the latter in particular is very touching; though we confess we are at a loss to understand why a man who had himself, as he says, preached during *twelve years*, though "a real unbeliever," should so greatly have taken to heart his son's honest avowal of his new opinions. It would almost seem as if he would have preferred that he should have concealed them, and gone on with his education professing to believe what he thought untrue, lest he should cut himself off from future preferment and throw himself upon his father for

support, for an indefinite period. We cannot reconcile such a supposition with much that is both sensible and devout in the elder Schleiermacher's letters. At any rate, the firmness of the son did not yield, and, with the aid and counsel of a very kind and judicious uncle, his mother's brother, he carried his point of being allowed to go to Halle to study for a year or two, with the view of making himself "efficient for some tutorship or other."

In connection with this change, we see clearly the straitened circumstances of the father, and his inability to do more than provide the merest necessaries for his son. He speaks frequently of his poverty, especially warning his son against purchasing *books*, as long as he can avoid it (p. 127), an extravagance which seems to have involved the good man himself in lasting troubles. To Halle, however, Schleiermacher goes, and is there provided with a little room in the house of his kind uncle, his great obligations to whom he acknowledges in very warm terms, in the autobiographical sketch before mentioned.

Of Schleiermacher's student life at Halle we learn very little. The most interesting passage relating to this period occurs in one of his later letters, in which he writes:

"First of all, let me give you a testimonial, or, rather, a sketch of my character, while I was at the university, which somebody, I no longer recollect whom, gave to my father. He communicated it to me afterwards, and even at the present moment I cannot conceive who it can have been who knew me so well then, when I hardly associated with any one. I was, he said, negligent in my person; had entirely the manners of one whose eye is turned inwardly; was cynical in my whole mode of life; very frugal when alone, but when in society, and to please my friends, capable of sacrificing even my most urgent necessities; industrious, but only by starts, and at all times a very unsteady attendant at the professorial lectures, which I seemed to despise; for the rest, seeking concealment, but when thrown into the society of the rich and high-born, behaving as if I were both in a still higher degree; cold and proud towards all who held a higher position than myself, but more especially so to my teachers and superiors."—I. 308.

Two years, indifferently used, at the university soon passed away. He then went to spend a year with his uncle, who had now exchanged his professorship for a living at Drossen (eastward of Frankfort-on-the-Oder). This appears to have been a year of much quiet study and progress in knowledge. "Then, also" (he says), "I began, for the first time, to think of the future; and, not without serious misgivings, I presented myself for the *pro licentia*, which I passed in the summer of 1790." In a letter from Drossen of this period, he gives his father a full account of his theological and philosophical reading, from which we see that he was now, at least, working hard, and preparing with diligence and success for his approaching examination. He does not conclude without a little appeal on money matters: ". . my

clothes" (he says), "are in such a dilapidated condition that I can hardly appear here with decency, let alone undertake a journey to Berlin."

Schleiermacher next obtained the situation of private tutor in the family of Count Dohna, at Schlobitten (south of Königsberg), and spent three years here, on the whole usefully and happily, if not very lucratively, employed. He appears to have preached occasionally at this period, and some very sensible advice from his father on the subject of sermons might here be quoted, did our space allow. The young man himself complains of the *heaviness* and *indistinctness* of his own sermons, and has asked for the good counsels of his experienced parent. The latter, among other things, recommends Blair as likely to help him to correct the faults of which he has spoken. Should any of our readers want a good subject for a sermon, or rather for a series of sermons, he will find one at p. 111, as well as some practical remarks on the same subject; e.g., "... You have not sufficiently held in mind that you were addressing a mixed auditory. The poor peasant also wishes to be edified, and his wish ought not to be overlooked." Again, "As regards the desire to exhaust the subject, ever remember that you are not carrying on a disputation, but that you are delivering an edifying discourse, and save your powers of exhaustion for your private conversations. For these latter also, secondly, reserve the desire to look at the subject from a new side."

During the Schlobitten period, Schleiermacher visits Königsberg, and spends "half an hour with Mr. Kant and a few other professors," of whom, however, he modestly refrains from giving any report, on the ground that so brief an interview is insufficient to enable him to say more than whether the great men are like their busts or portraits,—a remark that might be advantageously remembered by lionizers in general.

The engagement with the Dohnas is brought to a somewhat abrupt termination through the hasty temper of the head of the family. Schleiermacher returns to his uncle's at Drossen without any definite prospects, but by and by he obtains the situation of teacher in an institution in Berlin, for training schoolmasters, at a small salary of 120 dollars (about £18) a-year. Of this he says himself, "That I shall have a very hard time of it at first, and that my little savings will be swallowed up at once, is very evident; nevertheless, I do not see what else can be done, and I live in the hope that everything will turn out for the best."

But better things were in store for him, and it is not long before he is appointed assistant to an aged relative, the pastor of a church at Landsberg, with the prospect of succeeding him in his office. Here he remained until 1796. We see, too, that he is already beginning to attract notice as a preacher; as he says

to his father, "I do not expect that this running to hear me will continue; perhaps it will be the fashion a few weeks longer, and then it will cease like all fashions; but from my heart" (he adds) "I do wish that God's blessing may be upon my sermons, so that they may be sources of true edification and speak to the heart, as, I trust, they will ever come from the heart." He little foresaw the future that lay before him in Berlin, where, as we are told, "children crowded to his religious lessons, and men and women of the highest culture hung upon his lips when he addressed them from the pulpit." He as little anticipated that he should ever become eminent as an author.

This appointment at Landsberg is an evident source of satisfaction to the elder Schleiermacher. It does not appear what had become of the disbelief in the atonement and the deity of Christ. Most probably so able and subtle a mind would easily harmonize all such private difficulties with his open acceptance of the established formulas,—and that, too, without any greater sacrifice of truthfulness and consistency, in his own esteem, than is made by many of the signers of our Thirty-nine Articles at the present day. The father does not, so far as we learn, trouble himself on the subject, and his death shortly afterwards removed him out of the reach of all such sublunary troubles. The letter which Schleiermacher wrote to his sister Charlotte on this event, one of the most touching and beautiful in the collection, closes what may be called the first, or preparatory, period of his life.

In two years we find him again in Berlin, where he is "appointed chaplain to the establishment of the *Charité*," and where he remains till 1802. This interval of six years materially alters his position. He becomes conscious of his powers, and enters, we may say, upon a life of great intellectual and literary activity, —the forerunner of still greater distinction at Halle, and, later again, in Berlin. He now forms an intimate connection with various persons, remarkable both for their social position and their intellectual culture. Among these are F. Schlegel, with whom Schleiermacher for some time resides in common lodgings, and with whom he plans and begins the translation of Plato, which, however, was soon left by Schlegel entirely in his hands. Of his female friends at this time the most memorable is Henrietta Herz, the wife of a Jewish physician, who appears to have exercised a most important and beneficial influence on Schleiermacher, stimulating and even aiding his literary labours. Many of his letters are addressed to this lady, disclosing the very intimate and affectionate terms on which they lived. So much was this the case that his sister's fears appear to have been aroused, and to have led her to remonstrate with him on the subject. More than once he has to explain and justify to her his relation to his female friends. Here is a passage to this effect:

"One thing I am convinced you will believe on my word, viz., that

in my relations with those ladies there is nothing that could, even with the slightest appearance of justice, be unfavourably interpreted; you have not, I am sure, detected any evidence of passion in anything I have said about them, and I declare to you that I do not feel the least indication of anything of the kind. The time that I spend with them is by no means devoted to amusement only, but contributes directly to increase my knowledge and to stimulate my intellect, and I am in like manner useful to them. That Mrs. Herz is a Jewess did not seem at first to make such a very unfavourable impression upon you, and I thought that you felt as I do, that when there is a question of friendship, when we find a mind constituted like our own, we are bound to overlook such matters. The intercourse with her is not either so incompatible with my outward circumstances as you seem to suppose. Mr. Teller and Mr. Zöllner, two highly esteemed clergymen, both frequently visit the Herzes, though not on the same intimate and affectionate footing as I do; but it seems to me that if it be allowed to set aside an ancient prejudice for a less important purpose, it must be still more justifiable to do so for a higher object, and when the intercourse sought is of a more elevated nature."—I. 185, 186.

Schleiermacher's danger lay, however, in this very quarter. He became acquainted with, and then, strangely enough (but it was a fashion of the time), strongly attached to, Eleanore Grunow, the wife of a clergyman in Berlin, between whom and herself, we are told, in the mysterious language suited to such a subject, "all the essential inward conditions" of a true marriage were wanting. The tone of feeling in regard to divorce and re-marriage prevailing at this time in Berlin society, and indeed still too marked a feature in the social life of Germany, is well shewn in the account which the editors give of this unhappy passage of Schleiermacher's history:

"He believed" (we are told) "that were the connection" (i.e., between Eleanore G—— and her husband) "to be continued, her inner life could not fail to be entirely destroyed, and his opinions at that time (as he repeatedly expressed them without reference to this particular case) were in favour of the dissolution of such inwardly false unions. He even regarded such dissolution as *a moral duty*, in as far as it could take place without infringement of the social laws, which he demanded should be held in proper respect, while he considered the outward union as decidedly immoral, and as one which ought never to have been formed. These views were undoubtedly quite in accordance with the whole turn of his mind at that period, and indeed with those tendencies of the times in which he most participated, and there is, therefore, the less reason to suppose that they arose out of his personal relations to Eleanore G——. However, they favoured his hopes of happiness in connection with his earnest attachment to this lady; and although he considered the dissolution of her marriage as a thing morally called for, independently of any further eventuality, it was, nevertheless, understood, that when she should be free, he would marry her. Eleanore G——, however, could never, with full conviction, assent to these views; and after a long struggle and many hesitations, which Schleiermacher regarded as proofs of weakness, she at length determined to renounce

him (in the autumn of 1805); and from that moment all communication between them ceased entirely."—I. 142, 143.

Extracts from letters to this lady, as well as in reference to her, are given in the collection, from which we learn the strength of Schleiermacher's attachment, and finally the extreme distress which the rupture of the connection causes him.

A similar extraordinary fortune, but with a different result, befel his friend Schlegel. He also conceived a strong passion for the too celebrated Dorothea Veit, the young and accomplished wife of a Berlin banker. The latter is brought, by the intervention of Henrietta Herz, to consent to a divorce, and even grants a pecuniary provision to the future Mrs. Schlegel, generously allowing his eldest boy to remain with the mother, and paying her a considerable sum for his maintenance! In reference to this curious history, Schleiermacher gives us the following expression of his feelings in a letter to his sister:

"I have not felt anger against Mrs. Veit, but the extraordinary change in her destiny, and the strange and culpable light in which I know her conduct will be viewed by the world, grieves me very much, and is a source of deep anxiety to me, because she and Schlegel are so dear to my heart. In our opinion, who are so thoroughly acquainted with all the circumstances, she had very good and sufficient reasons for leaving this place. Schlegel's brother and sister-in-law invited her to their house, and she is now staying with them in Jena. Friedrich is also staying at Jena, and you may suppose what the world thinks of this and of the whole connection. They would, indeed, ere this, have contracted holy and legal bonds, as they are in truth most deeply attached to each other, were it not rendered impossible by the only condition on which her husband will consent to a divorce, viz., that she shall give up to him her youngest boy, who still requires her maternal care and the sensible education which she gives him. . . . . It is a most unfortunate affair, and from the bottom of my heart I pity the two people, who are exposed to so many humiliations only because they have acted more simply and uprightly than the world is accustomed to see people act." I. 243.

The intimate footing on which Schleiermacher stood with these Berlin friends appears in his own account of the celebration of his twenty-ninth birthday, also written for his sister. The whole scene is thoroughly German in its spirit, just such an incident as might take place any day among intimate friends:

"I was sitting in deep *négligé* at breakfast in the morning, when the eldest Dohna, who had not been to see me since his return, made his appearance. He stayed unusually long, and looked so often out of the window, that I could hardly help suspecting that there was something in the wind, though I could not imagine what it might be. At length came his brother, who began with expressing his congratulations, and I thus perceived that my birthday had been betrayed; and very soon after drove up a carriage with Mrs. Herz—whom I frequently visit with the Dohnas—and Mrs. Veit, the lady at whose house I was to spend the evening with Schlegel. The husbands of the two ladies sent

to excuse their absence on account of business. Suddenly my table was cleared, and again spread with chocolate and cakes, which had been ordered by Dohna. The most cordial congratulations poured in on me from all sides, as did also little presents, to keep up my remembrance of this friendly festivity. Mrs. Herz gave me a watch-guard, because my chain was in a most deplorable condition; Mrs. Veit gave me a pair of gloves and a wine-glass, out of which to drink the Burgundy which she had ordered for my stomach; and Schlegel, a small bottle of perfume for my linen, which he knows I am very fond of. You may conceive how delighted I was with these proofs of the sympathy of five persons who are very dear to me, and for that very reason how little I could say about it.

"Schlegel played me a little trick, by inciting the others to join *in chorο* in his old wish that I should be industrious, that is to say, that I should write books. Nine-and-twenty years, and nothing done as yet, he went on repeating, and I was at last obliged to give him my hand in solemn pledge, that I would write something original before the end of the year—a promise that weighs heavily on me, as I have not the least desire to be an author."—Pp. 162, 163.

He was speedily, however, to be an author, and we soon find him engaged on his first great work, the Discourses on Religion. He is busy with these in 1799, transmitting portions from time to time for the perusal and criticism of Mrs. Herz, who, as well as Schlegel, was among the friends who now most directly stimulated and influenced his mind. The work referred to bears the title, *On Religion: Discourses addressed to the Educated among its Despisers.* We cannot more briefly or fairly characterize it than in the few sentences in which it is mentioned in the Introduction:

"In point of religion, Protestant Germany was, at that period, pretty equally divided between Rationalism, that had degenerated into religious indifference, and Supernaturalism, that had petrified into a lifeless, hereditary acquiescence in an historically transmitted faith. In his discourses Schleiermacher addressed himself principally to those who looked down upon religion as an antiquated prejudice, or at the highest as a crutch to prop up morality, and considered piety as the sign of a weak mind; but the boldness with which he set aside all mere traditional faith, and proved true religion to have its source in the innermost feelings and deepest instincts of man, was in a manner an indirect attack upon the other party also."—I. xv.

Some works of minor importance followed the Discourses; and in 1802 Schleiermacher accepted the office of Court preacher at Stolpe, in Pomerania. Here during two years he lived in comparative seclusion, striving latterly against his unfortunate attachment for the lady before named. Here, too, he completed the first volume of his *Plato*, and his *Critical Inquiry* into existing systems of Ethics. We find him also in the most friendly, and more than friendly, correspondence with Ehrenfried von Willich, and his young betrothed, Henrietta von Mühlenfels, destined later to become Schleiermacher's own wife. The letters

which pass between the three, like others in the volume, are couched in terms of affection so strong as will doubtless appear open to the charge of strange exaggeration, almost of untruthfulness, to a reader of cool English temperament; but we must remember the different genius and far more demonstrative tendencies, in such matters, of many of the continental peoples, including even the Germans. The letters referred to are quite in keeping with the whole cast of Schleiermacher's nature. Many of the German words and phrases of endearment in common use in the family circle, are apt to appear to the Englishman overwrought or half-ridiculous. That may, however, be *our* defect and loss as much as anything else.

Here we must stop for the present, observing only, in conclusion, that the translator has done her work with very laudable skill, so far as we can judge without having the original to refer to. Some faults we have observed, however: "my heart shall always *lay* open before you;" "opportunities of observing me *close by*" (p. 64); "*perfectionizing* yourself in mathematics" (p. 70);—such expressions are not to be classed among the elegances of the English language. Sometimes there is an evident want of correctness, or rather of fulness, in the rendering; as where Schleiermacher, writing in Berlin, says that a new career is opened to him there after his return *from Prussia*, meaning the province of East Prussia; and where he says, to account for his loss of time one day, that he had walked "no less than *a mile and a half*;" doubtless we should understand a German mile and a half, i.e. some *seven* English miles.

SCRIPTURAL HYMNS. By SIR JOHN BOWRING.

No. XI.

"Forgetting those things which are behind" (Philip. iii. 13).

Forgetful of the things behind,
And pressing on to those before,
The inquiring and progressive mind
Turns history's teaching pages o'er,
To gather from the fleeting past
Substantial truths for time to come,
Holding the precious treasures fast
To guide our path and light our home.

For what is loving, right and true—
From dissolution and decay
Rescued—our pilgrim-journey thro'
Will fling its brightness on the way;
And while the sun from year to year
With his own living light may shine,
The ages as they disappear
Shall call forth glories more divine.

No. XII.

"My meditation of Him shall be sweet" (Ps. civ. 34).

SWEET shall be my meditation
On the records of salvation—
Not the songs which morning greet,
Music of the bees and birds,
All the eloquence of words,
Are so sacred and so sweet.

Sweet shall be my meditation
On the wonders of creation—
Flowers beneath and stars above,
Flowing streams and waving woods,
Busy scenes and solitudes,
All rejoicing in heaven's love.

Sweet shall be my meditation
On the joy, the consolation,
Which God's holy message brings
When entangled in the toils,
Treacheries, temptings and turmoils,
Of the earth's perplexing things.

Sweet shall be my meditation
Of that final consummation,
When this earth's vicissitude
Shall depart with shade and sin,
And heaven's day unveiled begin,
'Whelming all in light and good.

No. XIII.

"Let not the sun go down upon your wrath" (Eph. iv. 26).

LET not the sun go down upon thy wrath;
Passion may move thee, but let sober thought
Rule thee with influence more than passion hath,
So by thy Saviour's gentle words be taught.

Let not the sun upon thy wrath go down,
Leaving thee nought but darkness and its gloom,
Thine own self-condemnation and the frown
Of other judgments which are passion's doom.

Let not the sun go down upon thy wrath;
Wrath is a whirlwind which tears up the roots
Of kind affections, scattering on the path
Evil and hatred and their bitterest fruits.

Let not the sun upon thy wrath go down:
Thou know'st not what night's messages may be;
For the cold, sudden tide of death may drown
Every redeeming hope that smiled on thee.

THE UNITARIAN CHURCH.

THE word Church, as used among Christians, has at least three different meanings. By *the* Christian Church, we understand all who acknowledge the divine authority of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. All consistent Protestants must admit the right of every Christian to worship his Maker in the manner which best approves itself to his conscience, and consequently that any number of Christians are at liberty to form a congregation for social worship and religious instruction. A congregation so formed becomes *a* Christian Church. These are the widest and the most restricted meanings of the word Church; but there is another and a very important sense of the word. The Roman Catholic Church (as it calls itself and is too often called by those who are aware of the inaccuracy of the title), indeed, considers itself as the only true Christian Church, and confines the benefits of Christianity to those within its pale. The Greek Church we believe to be in principle the same as the Roman, the dispute between them being which is the true Church. With Protestants the case is different. Inconsistent as the conduct is of nearly all Protestant Churches with the great principle of Protestantism, the right of private judgment, and fond as they have been of denouncing all who deny any of their doctrines or separate themselves from their communion as heretics and schismatics, they have hardly gone so far as to condemn in express terms all who do not belong to their communion. In the far larger number of Protestant countries a system of doctrine and of discipline has been established, which is considered to constitute the national Church. Such are the Church of England, the Church of Scotland, the Church of Sweden, &c. Let us now look to the state of the Dissenters in this country. All branches of Dissenters have their own organizations, and each sect has its particular name, more or less freedom of opinion being allowed among different sects, but all of them having something peculiar to themselves, some bond of union, without which it is obvious that they could not be held together. If a man profess himself a Quaker, a Baptist, an Independent or a Wesleyan, there must be some ground of his preference of the particular connection to which he belongs. If it were not so, the sect would inevitably soon fall to pieces. We will endeavour to shew presently how a want of some bond of union has operated in an important body of Dissenters.

We now proceed to consider the case of the Unitarian Church, as in propriety of language it ought to be called, although some, for reasons which we will endeavour to shew are insufficient, refuse to adopt the name.

That there are a great number of congregations in this country in which the form of worship is strictly Unitarian, is a fact which *none can deny*; and no one has suggested, to our knowledge, any

other bond of union among them than the profession of Unitarian opinions. Unitarian congregations are of two classes: first, those which have been formed expressly as Unitarian—Essex Street, Little Portland Street, Brighton, and we believe some others. The far larger part, however, consists of old Presbyterian congregations. Have these latter congregations any other bond of union than the profession of Unitarian opinions and the exclusive use of Unitarian forms of worship? If they have, we must confess ourselves ignorant what it is. Much, indeed, has been spoken and written about free inquiry in allusion to this subject, but we do not find that any one has distinctly said that free inquiry can be the bond of union by which religious societies are or can be held together. A Quaker and a Swedenborgian, a Calvinist and a Unitarian, a Deist, a Mormonite and an Atheist, may all profess and practise free inquiry; but no sane person could think of forming all these persons into one religious body. But many who are descended from Presbyterian ancestors have an affection for the name, and think, with reason, that the English Presbyterians have done good service to the cause of religious freedom and of religion generally. The name Presbyterian as applied to this body of religionists has always been a misnomer, as the Presbyterian discipline was never established among them. Their character from the first has been as completely congregational as that of the Independents; and, as to discipline, they appear to have been only marked by their rejection of episcopacy. They strictly adhered in their early history to the doctrines commonly called orthodox. The nonconformists of that day, with a very few exceptions, would have rejected with horror Arian or Unitarian doctrines; and Richard Baxter, a man never to be mentioned but with the highest respect, is recorded to have approved of the clause in the Toleration Act which excluded all who denied the Trinity from the benefit of the Act, and to have said that he would "tolerate only those who were tolerable." The Presbyterian divines being the best educated and the most learned of the Dissenters, and being real lovers of truth and friends of free inquiry, many of them, at an early period after the Toleration Act, found it impossible to assent to all the doctrinal articles of the Established Church; and, pursuing their inquiries, Arianism, and afterwards Unitarianism, made great progress among them. The congregations could not be reasonably expected to travel at the same rate in the road of theological inquiry; and the necessary consequence was, that many of the ministers held one set of opinions, while their hearers for the most part held another. This could not possibly last long; and it is no easy question to answer, what the conduct of the ministers ought to have been in such circumstances. They saw distinctly the absurdity of expecting unanimity on all the doctrinal matters contained in the Creeds and Articles of the Established Church; and they felt strongly that no set of fallible men had or

could have a right to enforce on others the reception of any creeds which they had made or adopted. They therefore wisely rejected subscription to any creed, and assumed to themselves the right to study the Scriptures in an independent spirit and to form their own opinions. At the same time, finding their hearers far behind them in what they conceived to be sound and enlightened views of Christianity, they had to consider what their congregations could bear, and to regulate their instruction accordingly. Whether they were justified in concealing their altered opinions from their congregations, is a question which we will not presume to decide. One of them, we know, fully declared his own opinions respecting the person of Christ.* By renouncing creeds, however, and introducing no acknowledged bond of union in their place, they paved the way to their own destruction as a religious body; and few, we suppose, can now doubt that they would have entirely disappeared from the religious world if they had not embraced some distinct form of Christianity. This they have done, and the form is Unitarianism. Unitarianism has the advantage of requiring no creed, as its doctrines are the common doctrines of the Christian world, cleared of many of what are called orthodox dogmas. The worship of the one God and Father of all, without any distinction of persons, distinguishes it plainly and palpably from all other Churches; and, where a liturgy is used, the ground and basis of Unitarianism is shewn forth perspicuously. The rejection of the doctrine of the Trinity, indeed, is far from being the only distinction of Unitarians. Along with it and in consequence of it, they reject many opinions which they believe to be unfounded in scripture and to be inconsistent with just conceptions of the character of the Deity. No Unitarian holds the doctrine of Original Sin, or believes that Christ suffered to appease the vengeance of an angry God, which is called satisfying his justice. The Unitarian regards the Deity as one "whose tender mercies are over all his works," and "who sent his Son into the world to seek and to save that which was lost." These and the like sentiments they think fully sanctioned by our Saviour and his apostles, and they are in strict harmony with the doctrines of the ablest moral philosophers. Surely these are views of religion which we should endeavour to promote to the utmost of our power. We see no method so likely to effect this purpose as the cordial and earnest co-operation of all the congregations which we consider to form collectively the Unitarian Church. Every Unitarian congregation, indeed, is to be considered quite independent in the regulation of its own affairs; but the co-operation of the whole body for the purpose of promoting the views of religion which they profess, could hardly fail to produce very beneficial effects. We have already an important institution, the Unitarian Association; but their action might be greatly

* Dr. Lardner, in his well-known Four Sermons.

extended if they were acknowledged as the representative body of the affiliated churches of the Unitarians. How can a reasonable person expect any considerable advance among us while we appear to the world so loosely attached to our religious opinions as to shrink from adopting the only name by which they are distinguished? Among the idlest fancies that the ever-active mind of man has engendered, is the notion that a generalized Christianity, which has no definite views, can be the means of keeping together a Christian congregation for any length of time. We have often heard it asserted, and we have no reason to doubt the truth of the assertion, that Dr. Abraham Rees never explained to his congregation his opinions of controverted points of religion, and the large congregation under his ministry remained in ignorance of his opinions till the time of his death. What was the consequence? Just what any rational person might have anticipated: a remnant of the congregation was kept together for a short time by Mr. Davison, and then it came to an end. When a Christian Dissenting congregation has no distinctive principle or set of opinions which holds them together, they can be united only by a regard to their minister and a preference of his preaching. One will be of Paul and another of Apollos; but when Paul and Apollos disappear, division, and very probably the dissolution of the congregation, will follow.

Let us now advert to the objections which have been made to the name Unitarian as distinctive of our religious connection. We must first, however, return our thanks to Mr. Martineau for his courteous answer to our inquiry into the meaning of a passage in his letter. We, indeed, greatly regret that he should have supposed that we charged him with inconsistency. It seemed, indeed, to us that the words used by him in their ordinary signification did involve an inconsistency, but we added, "we should gladly and gratefully receive such an explanation as would shew that Mr. Martineau's words were intended to express something different from what they seem to us to import;" and we added, "we are encouraged to believe that such explanation may be given," &c. The explanation has been given; it is satisfactory, and we are grateful for it. In this letter, Mr. Martineau says, "the question is not about the importance of this or that discriminative doctrine, but about the propriety of fixing *any* polemically-selected doctrine as the permanent essence of church-life." We confess ourselves not able clearly to see what is understood by church-life. If we are to understand it to mean "religious life," no Unitarian will be so presumptuous as to deny that Christians of pure and holy lives are to be found in all the churches and sects into which the Christian world is divided; but that that circumstance should prevent our calling ourselves by the name which expresses our principles and the form of worship which we practise, we cannot at all understand.

T..

CORRESPONDENCE.

CRITICISMS ON THE NATIONAL REVIEWER.

SIR,

I AM desirous of being allowed a little space in your pages for a few observations on the letter in your January number of the Author of the Article on Ewald in the National Review, as I think it possible the notice I should take of it may be of rather different character from that of other correspondents who have already expressed or intend to give their criticisms, and may therefore still possess some interest for your readers; and to shew at once what statements in the letter of the reviewer I propose noticing, I will begin by quoting them, as both the best introduction for my remarks and as the necessary text to which I must refer for the comments I propose to offer.

"In Matthew we have probably the old Palestinian tradition regarding Jesus." Does this sentence mean that all the words, thoughts and actions related of Christ and others, and of the Divine purpose in him, are tradition, meaning such traditions as we know of in Christian and heathen records? "Between the line of thought in Matthew and that of Luke, written for a heathen convert, there is wide difference, implying considerable interval of time. The difference between John's and the three earlier Gospels proves it could not be written till the close of the first century, but of the greater Epistles of Paul there is no doubt. And there seems to me evidence that Christ's resurrection *or* ascension, whichever term we adopt (for both express the same mysterious fact, his passage from the present to the next life), were so witnessed to the minds of believers not through violations of natural law, but in virtue of deeper law affecting the relations of the seen and the unseen worlds, so as to convince them of the perpetuity of his existence and the reality of his occasional intercourse."

I quite agree with the reviewer that both the descriptions given in the historical books of our Saviour's appearances to his disciples after his death and resurrection, and the language of the Epistles when reasoning upon these great facts, are not consistent with the return of the risen Christ to all the conditions of the ordinary human life. I would particularly refer to the accounts of the appearance and disappearance of his presence or person as completely distinguished in the narrative from any conditions and possibilities of our natural bodies. And also to the language of St. Paul when he replied to the questioner, "With what body will the dead come?" "There is one glory of the terrestrial, one of the celestial; it is sown a natural, it is raised a spiritual body;" and to the rest of his argument on the resurrection and immortal life, as well as to that employed in 2 Cor. v., "Not that we would be unclothed, but we would be clothed upon with our dwelling which is from heaven." Taking together these strong evidences for the not literally human-conditioned body or existence in which after the resurrection Christ was manifested during his stay on earth, *what* it was his intention to declare in his own words to Mary, "Detain me not," &c.; to Thomas, "Thrust thy hand into the wound of my side;" to the rest, "Handle me, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me to have,"—after he, the doors being closed, stood in the midst of them,—seems to me best explained by the wise and searching words of St. Paul, "God giveth to *every* seed the body that pleaseth Him;" thus at once checking curiosity

and speculation, while giving the assurance to any timid fears, that even the body is not altogether dead, but that such a body as is adapted to the perfected life can be its dower there, as the earthly one has been to our life here.

It appears to me that the facts of Christ's renewed life were evidenced to the senses of the disciples in such a way as to make it the object of their clear and undoubting perception, so that their intellect might bear its full testimony in conjunction with the persuasion and true faith of the higher powers of their reason that "death could not hold him, that he is the first fruits of those that sleep, that in him all mankind will be made alive," but that the distinct character of this body, the exact nature of the heavenly dwelling, as not necessary because not practical for our knowledge while on earth, is not explained to us. For it seems natural that the kind of body in which the Christ appeared should not be made clear to us in the scripture narrative, since we know that we have no organs by which we could apprehend it without that perpetual miracle which such a change would render requisite, yet enough is told us to shew that the speculations which on the one hand tend to consider the body as the source of all evil, are as incorrect as on the other hand will prove those which would view it as the condition, if not the cause, of all good,—extremes which human thought has inclined towards at all ages of our human history, as it does at the present day.

But where the author proceeds to clothe his own view of the appearances of our Saviour to the disciples in such phrases as "a spiritual fact," a "reality made certain to a human soul not by the outward senses," the one statement appears to me contradictory to the other. A spiritual fact can only relate to the spirit, is purely internal, must be subjective, and has nothing to do with any external objective reality, nor consequently can affirm the existence of any other person, which is an objective proposition. So any direct communication of spiritual truth to human consciousness has no intelligible meaning. Consciousness implies the association, the application of mental, internal or subjective truth to some external objective phenomena, by which that which was before dark becomes light to us; and we see the objective phenomena by the subjective truth. But the terms, "a direct communication of spiritual truth," contain obviously no objective elements at all, and clearly therefore cannot be applied to our consciousness. "Unveiling the realities of the invisible world to the eye of the soul," should imply only an increase of internal truth to the mind, if by "invisible world" is meant the spiritual or mental world, not that which is only not seen by us, but is still objectively existent.

These positions or explanations of the reviewer appear also to be in opposition to that of his next sentence—"the effect on the apostles' minds requires the support of some presence assuring them that they in some way recognized Christ as a real person from the invisible world." This last proposition seems to agree perfectly well with the real statements and language of the New Testament, but to be quite distinct from a spiritual or internal fact or truth which is shewn to the inward eye of the soul.

Again, "that the resurrection of Christ was so witnessed to the minds of believers, not by the violation of any natural law, but in virtue of some deeper law affecting the relations of the seen and unseen worlds," seems to contain a not very intelligible statement of the author's mean-

ing; for the witnessing to the human mind of the resurrection by a deeper law affecting some unseen world, would of course in correct language be termed a miracle. It would not be a violation of Natural law, since that regulates or describes relations in the seen Natural world; for we must recollect that a law of Nature has no real existence, implies no necessity in Nature itself, but only signifies the mode in which our minds *must* think about Nature in order to understand her; but the impression by a higher than natural power of an objective or external phenomenon on a higher subjective state of the mind or sense than the human, at once takes us into another state, and we see that everything which happens, or, as the reviewer expresses it, "is witnessed to the human mind," by other than natural channels, is so effected by miracle. And doubtless this is what the reviewer means to express in employing such phrases as "lifting the veil," &c. The same attribute of miraculous will indeed equally apply to the interpretations which can be given by any theory of the appearances of the risen Saviour; for if we admit the intercourse of a higher world into our present, we admit necessarily the idea of miracle with it. The theory of a human body restored to life, but not the human life, requires the acceptance of a miracle for our belief; equally so does the theory which considers the risen and immortal body not as a human, but a glorified or more perfect body; equally so does the reviewer's, that it was "a living presence from the invisible world." All these forms of manifestation require a miracle to be witnessed to and apprehended by our natural human minds. We have no hesitation in believing that the reviewer will unite with the fullest cordiality in the truth of this position with those who hold other opinions on the mode of the resurrection. In the reviewer's estimate of the date at which the New Testament writings were composed, since he ranges the Gospels between the years A.C. 60 to 90, having allowed to St. Paul's Epistles the usual dates of from 50 to 60, the margin which he has thus left for the introduction of later opinions and new additions cannot be very large, if we consider the vast nature of the revelation contained in the message of any one of our Gospels, the variety and multiplicity as well as the depth and height of its subjects, and the difficulty of comprehending all its fulness by the human mind; so that instead of suggesting the imaginary hypothesis that the belief of twenty or thirty years would have necessarily added much development or new views to the gospel, we shall feel rather inclined to suppose that they would hardly have sufficed for the study of the whole as delivered, and that thus, instead of this great body of doctrine being increased and matured, every decade after the inspiration which introduced it had ended would have let slip some truth, dropped out some grains of the treasure of revelation entrusted to it, as we know was in reality the case during the centuries which immediately followed upon the teachings of Christ and his apostles. Such has been always the history of great religious movements. To take the most recent instances, no great changes occurred, certainly no improvements, in Wesley's doctrine during thirty years from the first great impulse he gave to religious feeling. Neither did our own view of Christian truth change from its fundamental ideas for a much longer space of time from its rise in England two centuries ago.

It would be of great interest if the reviewer had explained with some clearness what is the meaning of the assertions he makes of "the very different tone of thought and feeling between the several Gospels, implying *progressive* conception of the facts of Christ's history and of the fun-

damental ideas of his teaching, such as must have required a considerable lapse of time to account for," since the questions thus viewed are assuredly very important to the criticism and interpretation of the Gospels; and although the reviewer has spoken of such considerations being those a Unitarian minister will appreciate, though less intelligible to others who have not much exercised their minds with such inquiries, yet since Unitarians not in the ministry are much in the habit of studying the Gospels and comparing passage with passage, and as they are generally accustomed to consider these Gospels as speaking one language and declaring one truth, they will, I am sure, unite with me in earnestly hoping that the reviewer will bring forward the grounds for his opinions on so highly important a subject; for it is obvious that any theories regarding the details of the resurrection and the miracles may represent only the state of the writer's metaphysical and physical knowledge; but the question whether the facts of the Gospels are the Truth of a Revelation, or represent the "opinions" and the "traditions" of some men like ourselves, is one which affects so deeply every Unitarian that it should not be confined to the study of a Unitarian minister. The effect would surely have been very different to the science of history and the growth of the human mind, whether its students had had to fill their memories with the romances of Geoffrey of Monmouth, the fabliaux of the Table Ronde, or the Hindu epics and puranas, or if they can lay their foundations in the histories of Herodotus, Tacitus, Rapin, De Thou and Grote; and if this would be a vital question in our history of facts, how infinitely magnified becomes its importance when the choice is of results to be deduced from the thinking and imagining of a few human minds, and those uneducated ones, upon the Infinite, the Real and the True, or from the expressed communication of the Creator of all these to us concerning them and our relations with them. Perhaps from being less constantly occupied with the study of commentaries, the laity may bring a fresher and more acute perception to the judgment of questions so strikingly important and of a scale of magnitude which cannot be overlooked.

Again, I wish to refer to another apparent inconsistency in the method of argument adopted by the reviewer. Surely, if we suppose the New Testament writings merely the reports and thoughts of very fallible men, taking of course different views of their wide theme, committing many oversights, contradicting and altering each other's statements, and full of difficulties in their comprehension and application of the vast message they had received, the reviewer can lay no stress on any contradictions or divergences in them, and his whole theory, both of dates and of appearances, must totter to the ground. Neither can I understand how any other of his Scripture criticisms founded on internal evidence, i. e. on words, can have the least correctness or authority to allege in its favour, nor consequently how any important points in authenticity (and how important become any which rise above the most minute in the scale of the immortal and the infinite!) could be decided on such evidence. And we sweep away at once, with all power of proving, all the foundation of truth which we had sought and prayed for a Revelation to give us. Such criticism, founded upon the negation of all basis of truth, would seem as incongruous and vain a labour as does the opposite method employed by a respondent to the reviewer, who, asserting full belief in the authority and truth of the New Testament, cites

the false and unfulfilled Judaic expectations of the evangelist and apostle as proofs that the Gospel of St. Matthew and the Epistle of St. Paul must have been written at those early dates which would, it is obvious, have given their authors the fullest knowledge of the words and facts, or of the reality of what they have described.

Perhaps it would be of advantage, in our study of philosophic and mental questions, if we would accept the validity of this dictum, that the nearer the approach to truth in the premises, the greater unanimity will there be in the results deduced; while the less there is of truth in the premises, the more divergence and contradiction will assuredly present themselves in the conclusions.

THE AUTHOR OF "INSPIRATION, HOW RELATED TO REVELATION?"

ON THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.

SIR,

HAVING read the learned and elaborate discussions in the late Nos. of the Christian Reformer on the nature and form of the resurrection of Christ, it has occurred to me as rather singular that no reference has been made to Luke xxiv. 36—39, &c. Unless the authenticity of the statements contained in these verses could be impugned, they afford conclusive evidence of a bodily resurrection. Luke neither invented the narrative, nor did Christ represent an optical illusion as a substantive fact. The words "flesh and bones" were necessarily intended, and must have been understood by those who heard them, to signify a real human body.

S. Petherton, Feb. 8, 1860. J. NICHOLETTS.

REPORT OF MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE, LONDON.

SIR,

I THINK I have observed of late years that the College Reports have been apt to branch out into dissertation and irrelevance. Such a tendency never speaks well for the institution they tell us of, and is quite alien from what a genuine report should be; viz., as its name implies, a simple account of what it relates to. That is all we want and look for. We make our own reflections. It is supplied to us for that very purpose. We may perhaps properly indulge the writer with a closing remark; but beyond this it is hazardous to go. And I fear the Report of Manchester New College, just issued, has incurred the risk. I fear, too, the incurring it has verged into what by some will be regarded as a degree of arrogation and obscurity. A more serious offence, in our eyes, is an approach to the blot of Mr. Kingsley's style so noticeably rebuked by the National Review, viz., the introduction of the Great Name in a way that hurts our religious sense. Rather lightly the reviewer says of him, "The expressions alluded to ('God's work,' 'God's feasts,' 'God's heroes') appear to be dictated by an appetite for strong language operating on a gentleman in orders; and are, in fact, we believe, Mr. Kingsley's way of swearing." I hope as a religious communion we may never be drawn into such phraseology. It will be a sign that our genuine religion is gone.

Feb. 13, 1860. J. H. RYLAND.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

The Revelation of God and Man in the Son of God and the Son of Man: Six Sermons preached in Renshaw-Street Chapel, Liverpool. By John Hamilton Thom. Pp. 142. London—Whitfield.

THIS valuable contribution to our theological literature is calculated to render excellent service in giving light to many now sitting painfully in the dark shadow of orthodoxy. Compact in form, striking in sentiment, devout in spirit, these Six Discourses contain a body of Christian doctrine well adapted for the relief of those who are thus suffering under the tenacious terrors of the popular creed, from which they have found no way to a purer and a more scriptural faith. We have reason to believe that in Mr. Thom's representation of the Unitarian doctrine two classes of minds will receive satisfaction, which divide perhaps almost equally between them the outer zone of the circle of exclusive churches. For neither heart nor intellect is truly at peace in Calvinism from the moment that they are suffered to put forth their natural testimony against it. In some persons who have been educated in that unnatural system of religious belief, the two phases of mental character unite; but their fear of losing in Unitarianism the heart's warm reverence for the Saviour keeps the intellectual doubt in suspense. To the honest inquirer of this order, the views of the present work will be especially welcome. It is markedly liberal, while yet distinctively Christian. It is not necessary to say that all Unitarians agree with every point in the theology of this work. We are sure that they do not. Different views might easily be collected from our various writers in regard to several of the most important topics upon which these Discourses dwell. We may not all assent to the idea of the gospel miracles here exhibited, nor to that of the action of the Divine Spirit within the soul of universal man, nor even to much that is here said respecting the representative and ideal manhood of Jesus. No man has yet been authorized, nor any body of men, to declare the law of Unitarian freedom or limitation in religious belief, though we do not differ from each other in anything like the proportion of diverse Evangelical interpretations of what they affect to designate the same fundamental doctrines. But however variously regarded among ourselves, as they may legitimately be, the views presented in this work will favour its influence, as we believe and trust, in the direction just indicated. We know of how small use it would be to commend the volume before us to the condescending notice of some who exalt themselves by reviling others, and who might learn with sorrow in how earnest and devout a form the most thorough Humanitarian doctrine may admit of being clothed; but we are of opinion that very many who rank amongst the orthodox would receive with gratitude the knowledge of Unitarianism after the manner in which Mr. Thom so strikingly, with mingled elegance and force of thought, presents it. They are held back from our profession by an ungrounded fear of falling into universal scepticism if they remove from their position in the established churches. They cannot reconcile the liberty of religious thought with discipleship in Christ. They are assailed on all hands with the question as to where their doubts will

stop. They do not perceive that these honest doubts arise upon the ground of the sincere faith in God and in moral truth which they, in common with us, already securely hold. They may study with comfort such a passage as the following, which lays down the proper basis of Christian union in full consistency with the utmost rights of free human thought:

"It is usual to have ascribed to us, and occasionally by some of ourselves, that ours is a negative Christianity. They who speak thus, speak in rashness and in ignorance. Is God manifest in the flesh, a negative confession of Christian Faith? Is the Word made flesh and dwelling amongst us, recognized as the normal condition of Human Nature, a negative profession of Christian Duty?"—P. 76.

"I shall be told that this is the end and aim of *all* Christian Churches—that this is no peculiarity of ours—that never did a Christian Church exist, that would not define, and find, its central life in the purpose to develop in Human Nature the Image of God given to us in the Man Christ Jesus. *This is so.* Christ is *not* divided. This is the common ground of Christian union. All Christendom agrees in this, that God reveals His Son in us in order that in each soul of Man the same Image of the Father may come into full lineament and life. This *is* no peculiarity of ours: in this we are differenced from no other Christian Church,—and no other Christian Church is differenced from us. What then *is* our peculiarity? This simply: that we take this, this ground on which we do *not* differ from the rest of Christendom, *for the whole of the Christian peculiarity*,—that we suffer nothing more than this to enter into the definition of Christianity, or into the constitution of a Christian Church. Our peculiarity is this, that taking it as our aim to grow in the likeness of God after the Image of Himself He has given us in the Man Christ Jesus, we pursue that aim under the *conditions* of absolute *Liberty* as to the views of God and of his Providence that may individually commend themselves to us, and by *means* of simple allegiance to our own convictions of Truth as God may shew it to us: *our object*, the Image of God, to have Christ formed within us: the *conditions*, freedom to receive help and light from the Source of all grace and knowledge: the *means*, personal fidelity to the light given to each one of us. Now all Christian Churches agree with us in our *object*, the reproduction in each of the Image of God as Christ has shewn it to us—and all *real* members of those Churches agree with us as to the *means*, personal fidelity to our own Truth, to our own best conceptions of God and of His relations to Human Nature; but *we* stand alone as to the individual mental *conditions* under which this aim is to be pursued, these means employed,—absolute Liberty, a Liberty never shortened, never bound, never closed, to receive whatever fresh light God may give us, and to expect new light for ever upon His Being, His Providence, His Grace, His methods of applying that Grace, His personal relations to the human spirit, the mysteries of His infinite Nature. Upon these subjects we dare make *no Articles of Religion*; in these directions we dare not *define* the manifold immensity of God. To believe that God is the Father of every human spirit,—and that Jesus Christ is the fullest likeness to God that Human Nature can exhibit, the pattern of all our divine destiny up to the entrance on Heavenly life,—we dare make nothing else essential to our Christianity. Other Churches recognizing the same object, employing the same means, may grow in the Christian life, though in all other respects their views of the theory of Religion are different from ours; but if they grow, it is because they *do* employ the same means, absolute fidelity of confession and of life to their own spiritual perceptions of God."—Pp. 77—79.

We notice further in these Sermons a point of particular interest at the present time. There are persons who conceive so meanly of human

nature as to think that it cannot, by any given measure of divine grace, exhibit the perfect moral likeness of God. Jesus therefore must have been of another nature before he appeared invested with the conditions of humanity. As man, his being was not sufficiently mystical, they think, to justify the strong figurative language of certain portions of the New Testament description. There is a painful craving for something more unintelligible than what is called the bald Unitarian doctrine. These Discourses do not palter with this morbid tendency. Not only do they speak of the Saviour in his perfect manhood, precisely in the manner of the Scriptures, but they insist, with unanswerable force, upon this conception of him in its simplicity as an essential element in the doctrine of the gospel. Mr. Thom does not maintain this point of the strict humanity of Jesus incidentally, or as though it offered a mere happy coincidence with all the other judgments of a liberal creed. He dwells upon the fact with an emphasis which discovers his own deep sense of its religious value. It is one base of his whole superstructure of theological doctrine. It is among the roots of his devotional sentiment. And the doctrine is seen to be of a character which, thus held, is unassailable. Either his theology is altogether at fault, or it must stand upon this support in "the Mediator, the *man* Christ Jesus." Considering how strongly Mr. Thom brings to view the divine side of the life and character of Jesus, the reader will perceive with what force his description of the Man of Sorrows is made, of whose divineness his humanity is constituted the obvious and necessary basis. With one slight exception which might be taken to the employment of the term "permitting" as applied to anything which man may do in relation to the Almighty, we quote with pleasure the following:

"But if Christ did not suffer as Man, if the Atonement he effected, meaning by Atonement the oneness of his Will with the Will of his Father, was wrought out not by Man permitting God to inspire and hold him up, but by the strength and inspiration of an Archangel or of an Eternal Son, then, setting aside all physical or metaphysical difficulties, why was he tried by the measure of *our* trials—how were our sufferings and difficulties an ordeal for *him*—why were not his temptations commensurate with his Nature—what is the moral value to us of a victory in which the tasks *remain* only human, whilst the strength brought to meet them is inaccessible and superhuman—or how is it that in dealing with the things of the Spirit, the things of absolute reality and truth, we can suppose that the Revelation of God would exhort us to seek help from the Throne of Grace in the times of our need because of One who felt our infirmities and knew our temptations and passed sinless through them, if that One was only to outward appearance placed in a human condition, but all the while with weapons that belonged only to a celestial armoury, and a spirit that had walked the courts above, concealed beneath the robes of his flesh? What encouragement could it give *us* to be confident of strength, if we will look for it to God, that an Archangel or an Eternal Son conquered here in our poor conflicts of the earth—or how could the Author and Finisher of our Faith exhibit the possibilities of *our* Nature on a Nature that is loftier than is ours? No one but a Man can feel as a Man feels them the infirmities of a Man; no one but a Man can know the temptations of a Man,—and that One who was not a Man, weighed upon only by our burdens, exposed only to our temptations, was without failure of trust or strength, is no more a revelation of human capability, no more an earnest of human salvation, no more a warrant for the Father's invitation to walk in the same steps, and take up the same cross, and arm ourselves with the same mind, and put on the Lord Jesus, than the vision of an Archangel who lives and has ever lived in the light of

Heaven, and veils his face before the Throne, would be a just measure for the faith of mortal men. Is it in this way that the God of Truth deals with us? Alas! how unreal must we ourselves have first become, how shadowy and scenical in our ways of looking at the Revelations of God, how far removed from the childlike faith that the things of our experience are the things of His Spirit, before we could believe it!"—Pp. 40—42.

Other remarks on, and other extracts from, this admirable volume we must postpone to our next number.

Children of other Lands. Groombridge and Co.

This little book contains "Fridolia and Babeli" (a Swiss tale); "Meek-eye, or the Ship of the Desert" (an Arabian Night's adventure); "The Box of Bonbons" (a French tale); "Ivan's Dream" (a tale of Siberia); "The Forest Festival" (a sketch of German life); and "The Lost Slipper" (a Turkish tale). These attractive titles are fully borne out by their interesting narratives. They teach by example, and shew to our young people of England that goodness and virtue and the true religion of the heart may be found in all countries, as well as youthful faults and failings. We recommend them to our young friends, and to many too who are beyond childhood.

Life at Threescore. By Albert Barnes. Philadelphia. 1859.

This is a delightful autobiographical sketch by a Christian man approaching his grand climacteric. We shall be disappointed if we cannot ere long describe its principal features to our readers. The man who is at sixty "hopeful in regard to the world, to truth, to religion, to liberty, to the advancement of his race," and who believes that "the world is growing better, not worse," is a witness whose evidence all good men will wish to hear in detail.

A Day Out: a Summer Ramble in Daisy Nook. By Benjamin Brierley. Pp. 64. Manchester—Kelly.

If amongst our readers there are any that understand and relish the fine Doric of the Lancashire dialect and the sterling qualities of the Lancashire character, let them read this remarkable little book, in which they will find much humour, some wit, an eye for the beautiful in nature, and a heart that warms towards what is good and noble in the human character. It is the production of an operative in a cotton factory, and is creditable alike to his head and heart.

Rights and Condition of Women. By the Rev. Samuel J. May, of Syracuse, New York. Reprinted from the Fourth American Edition. London—Whitfield.

We doubt whether a sermon is a convenient shape wherein to mould the discussion of a great social question like that of the Rights and Condition of Women. Still we recommend all who take an interest in the subject to read Mr. May's sermon. It does not exhaust the subject, but it treats parts of it very ably. This we say without professing agreement with all his conclusions.

INTELLIGENCE.

UNITARIAN HOME MISSIONARY BOARD.

The annual public examination of the students of this very useful institution took place at Manchester on Monday, Jan. 23rd, and two following days. In addition to the Tutors, there were official examiners appointed, viz., Rev. Dr. Hutton, Rev. Henry Green and Rev. Russell Carpenter. On the first day, Rev. W. Gaskell examined the classes in the Greek Language, Grecian History and English Language; and Dr. Beard the classes in Ecclesiastical History and the Geography of Palestine. On Tuesday, Mr. H. A. Bright conducted an examination on the Theology of the Unitarian Church. Dr. Beard examined the class in the Old Testament Theology in the book of Job, and Rev. J. H. Hutton examined the class in Political Economy. On the third day, Dr. Beard renewed the examination in Old Testament Theology, the subject being the Pentateuch; he also took the class in Christian Oratory, and examined them on Chrysostom and on the general subject of the composition of sermons; and the class in Hebrew Archæology, the topics selected being the origin, spirit, mission and literary products of the Hebrew nation. The examination was attended by a succession of visitors, who, we are informed, appeared much interested in the work and gratified by the results. We regret that we cannot give our own personal impressions, having been unexpectedly prevented from attending the examination. But the impression made on one of the examiners, the Rev. Henry Green, will be gathered from the following extracts from an address read by him at the close of the examination:

"I have listened with attention to the papers which have been read, examined many that had been written, and marked the progress of the *viva-voce* questionings and answerings as they have taken place. I may therefore be qualified in some degree to state the impressions on my own mind, and to give the assurance, as I do most heartily, of the satisfaction it has been to me to note the extent of the theological information which the lectures of the Tutors cover, and the earnestness and success with which the missionary students have made that information their own inalienable possession, a freehold for their lives.

"The original language of the Christian Scriptures,—the geography and natural history of Palestine,—the parentage, grammatical structure and rich literature of our native English,—the sources, province and special relations of Ecclesiastical History,—and those glorious developments of human mental power which Greece achieved and beyond which we have not yet advanced,—these were the subjects to which I was glad to be a listener on our first day's examination. Some of them must have presented considerable difficulties to young men whose previous training had not prepared them for critical or theological studies; but it was evident that the harness had been put on with a resolute spirit, and that the work was done with a determination to become evangelists who could rightly divide the word of divine truth. . . .

"The second day's work was mainly occupied with the examination on the 'Theology of the Unitarian Church,' for the purpose of deciding the prize so liberally and thoughtfully offered by Mr. H. A. Bright, of Liverpool. I know not why our theology should to so great a degree be regarded as the domain, the deer-park or the pheasant-ground of exclusive teachers, where only the professional theologian is to go stalking along and holding his murderous battues; sure I am the church must be in a sounder state when its educated lay members become masters of its great doctrines and principles, and both direct by their knowledge and cheer by their presence and encouragement the students of divinity at their toil. Honour to the men among us who,

> 'Not seeking in the school of pride
> For precepts over dignified,'

gather here to shew that they esteem for their very work's sake the learners and scholars who are destined to become the missionaries of our faith! I would that others also came to this school of our future prophets, and by the kindly word and loving work raised and sustained our minds. The results of the competition I leave Mr. Bright to announce.

"Political Economy in lectures by Rev. Joseph H. Hutton, whose absence we regret and whose character we admire, was the next theme, and my notes tell me, if my memory fails, how clear and forcible were many of the papers read. Political Economy for missionary students!—the science of national wealth for those who are to set forth a world's salvation? And why not! Is there a better mental exercise, or in the compass of human knowledge one branch of study which in its true bearings, as pointing out the way to the highest well-being of the social com-

monwealth, can so directly prepare the mind for advocating on just principles what will promote a nation's progress in sound morals? In this view Political Economy is well introduced among the studies of the students of the Missionary Board.

"If to announce work without stint is to announce good tidings, this third day's labour has verily been a gospel of work. An iron man with an iron will and threefold brass around him surely devised that from nine to one and from three to five, during six mortal hours as registered by Shrewsbury clock, the sons of Atlas should emulate their sire and bear on their shoulders the Old Testament theology of the Pentateuch, Hebrew archæology and English literature, the Christian oratory of him of the golden mouth, senior and middle Greek, the composition of sermons, and the literary products of the Hebrew nation. But so it is; the burden has been borne; and here we are sitting or standing at our ease, and rejoicing that we neither shrunk from the effort nor fainted by the way. Be assured the effort itself is a training of no mean value; and when the examinations of this third day are characterized as they deserve, that effort must appear as bestowed upon some of the highest literary preparations that the missionary of divine truth requires...

"As far as language can train the mind, our native English is no mean discipline for extending and enlarging its powers. Pursued with the purpose of ascertaining its forms, changes and alliances, what was its original stock, and how in virtue of conquests as well as of external influences it has been modified and improved, the study of the English language calls for distinctions almost as subtle and reasonings as acute as those which the Greek and Roman tongues demand. This study has too a special superiority; it leads us to the very shrines of our English thought, where we see how they grew and were modified and took the wings that tire not with the flow of time. There is probably no little waste of mental power when languages foreign to our infancy occupy the best years of life; and therefore when the mind has become to a considerable degree matured, as in the case of the young men of the Missionary Board, their own language is the proper one for peculiar attention; and if they put it into the crucible and apply the tests of observation and reasoning, and note how a noble literature has grown from the forests and marshes of the old Germany and Friesland, till its fruits are for nurture to the religion and the *freedom of the* world, I am persuaded we shall conclude the Englishman's best study is the English language, and the preacher's great help for developing and enforcing truth a loving reverence for the great masters of the English tongue. . . . .

"In conclusion, I must invoke the aid of a great master of practical wisdom, who taught mankind to aim at putting the square peg into the square hole, and to fill a circular cavity with a circular block. Nearly sixty years ago, when this old mortality of mine was young, he gave forth elementary sketches of Moral Philosophy, and in one of them treats of the Conduct of the Understanding. Truth he speaks of as the food for our soul's growth, as something like the Persian fire upon the mountains that goeth not out day nor night, and he sums up in these glowing words: 'Therefore if any young man here has embarked his life in pursuit of knowledge, let him go on without doubting or fearing the event,—let him not be intimidated by the cheerless beginnings of knowledge, by the darkness from which she springs, by the difficulties which hover around her, by the wretched habitations in which she dwells, by the want and sorrow which sometimes journey in her train; but let him ever follow her as the angel that guards him and as the genius of his life. She will bring him out at last into the light of day, and exhibit him to the world comprehensive in acquirements, fertile in resources, rich in imagination, strong in reasoning, prudent and powerful above his fellows in all the relations and in all the offices of life.' Noble words, are they not! from that true friend of knowledge and freedom for the soul, Sydney Smith! May they be fulfilled in the experience of the young men whom I have had the honour of listening to at these examinations of the Unitarian Missionary Board; and as you, my auditors, bear them in mind, may they cover, what I am conscious is in this address, 'a multitude of sins'!"

We are able to give a copy of the questions on the Theology of the Unitarian Church, prepared by Mr. Bright himself, who generously offered the prize for the successful student.

"1. Explain the word 'Faith,' as it occurs in the New Testament. 2. Shew the distinction between the Sabellian theory and the belief that our Heavenly Father has given us three revelations of himself,—through Creation, through Christ, and through the Holy Spirit. 3. Give, according to the best authorities, the chronological order of the books in the New Testament, and the leading characteristics of their authors. 4. In what way have several eminent Unitarians en-

deavoured to reconcile a belief in the distinct personality of the Holy Ghost with their belief in the absolute Unity of God? And give your views on this question. 5. Quote the Proem of St. John's Gospel, and shew that any Trinitarian interpretation is inconsistent in itself. 6. Shew the fallacy of the chief Trinitarian arguments founded on the Old Testament. 7. Mention the different forms of Church government which, at various times, have existed in the Unitarian Church, and what you conceive to be the advantages of each. 8. What is the Unitarian view of the Christian Sacraments? 9. Shew that the orthodox doctrine of Original Sin is opposed to the teachings both of Nature and of Christ. 10. By what means can the Theology of the Unitarian Church in England be brought to bear more widely upon the people?"

The prize was gained by Mr. J. C. Street; and we cannot do better than offer a corrected report of the remarks made by the donor of the prize on presenting it to the successful candidate.

Mr. HENRY A. BRIGHT, of Liverpool, then stepped forward, and in presenting his prize to Mr. James Street for the best paper on the "Theology of the Unitarian Church," spoke as follows:—I have the greatest pleasure, Mr. Street, in begging your acceptance of these volumes—Conybeare and Howson, Stanley and Jowett. Your papers on the "Theology of the Unitarian Church" seem to me admirable. Your answer to the last question, how our theology might be brought to bear upon the people, I will venture to retain for myself. I hope that these volumes may be of some value to you. I hope that they will enable you to see how far our views have tempered other churches, and aid you in understanding the Apostle of the Gentiles. I have, by the leave of the institution, been allowed to offer a prize for next year on the "Ecclesiastical History of the Unitarian Church;" and allow me to say that, while thanking Mr. Green for the kind words he has spoken of me, I consider that I, as a member of the Unitarian church, bound up heart and soul in it, am doing no more than a simple duty, and one from which I cannot shrink. I believe that when I am doing my utmost I am but doing my simple duty as a layman of the church. Perhaps I may say a few words as to what I mean by the ecclesiastical history of the Unitarian church, and why I conceive it to be a question of very great importance; and should I, by any unfortunate accident, say one word to wound any one in anything I am about to say, believe me that such a word is entirely unintentional. Of course, in expressing my own opinions strongly—for I hold them very firmly—I must expose every now and then what I believe to be fallacies; but I never willingly wound or hurt any one who holds opposite opinions. With regard to the Unitarian church, allow me to say that I hold that there is an invisible church of God, composed of good and holy men of all churches, of all creeds, of all theologies, and of those who have no theology at all. I do believe, with Matthew Arnold, that there are "children of a second birth whoin the world cannot tame." And if I may venture to quote his words farther I would say,—

"Christian or Pagan, king or slave,
Soldier or anchorite,—
Distinctions we esteem so grave
Are nothing in their sight;
They do not ask, who pined unseen,
Who was on action hurled,—
Whose one bond is that all have been
Unspotted by the world."

I believe that, beyond the invisible church, there is a Christian church, founded on earth by our Lord Christ, and of which he is the Leader in heaven. I believe that there is one flock and one Master, and that all who call themselves by the Christian name belong to him. But I hold this likewise, that in the great Christian army—it is done by the will of God—there are many regiments. In the Christian church there are various denominations or churches, and I will not shrink from my definite church where God has placed me—I will not move away from that regiment to which Christ has called me. And therefore it is that while I believe it my business to make myself a member of the invisible church of God, while I believe it my business to make myself a worthy member of the church of Christ, I must do my duty also in the regiment to which Christ has called me, the Unitarian church. I cannot see how or where the harm of this can lie. I cannot understand why, to take an analogous case, I may not be patriotic, because all men are my brothers. I am unable to understand why I may not be peculiarly attached to my own family, because I belong to the general family of man. Therefore I cannot understand why I am not to do my best for the peculiar household of faith in which I am placed. This feeling of love for my own church does not prevent me from appreciating others. Among my own truest friends are clergymen of the Churches of England and Rome. I value them, and they value me, because we feel that we are earnestly doing our best for the several churches to which we belong.

It is our want of earnest striving for our church that makes Unitarianism so unpopular. You may trace this in all our opponents' attacks. Thus Isaac Taylor infers we are mere dilettanti, who do not seem to care about one thing or the other. I believe that this church life requires encouragement. We must do more for it than we have yet done. The absence of it has made many of our best families leave us. Some thirty of my own relatives have gone over in my own time to the Church of England, and most of them because there was so little church life among ourselves. The knowledge of this want is springing up not only here but in America. When I first read the writings of Sylvester Judd, I found that he was calling up feelings which were my own. And Dr. Bellows is endeavouring to build up the Americans into a definite church. How is this end best to be promoted? I agree entirely with something that fell from Mr. Street yesterday, that it is not to be done by controversy, for controversy is a state of war, and a church can be up-built by only the arts of peace. Controversy is often necessary; but with great grief I have often seen able ministers going forth spending their strength upon some matter of controversy, coming back weary and worn, bringing little fruit. I have thought that if they had spent that time in catechetical teaching or pastoral visitation, they would have been doing a greater work. I must say that I know of nothing more important for the building up of this church feeling than a knowledge of the ecclesiastical history of our church. Mr. Bright proceeded to relate a personal anecdote to shew the benefits which he had derived from church history. When a boy at Rugby, all his fellow-scholars were about to be confirmed, and the head master, now Bishop of London, sent for him and urged him to be confirmed likewise. He was very miserable in his isolation, but turned to see what light he could derive from the history of the church, and then he saw how people had been tempted and persecuted on account of the principles which he held, and he gained strength sufficient to say that he would not be confirmed. Such, said he, would ecclesiastical history do for many of the younger members of our church. One circumstance of importance in connection with ecclesiastical history is, that it gives not only the history of sects, but also of the development of doctrine. This is a matter of importance. I do not think that the Unitarian church has fully developed out into what it will become. I do not believe that we have exhausted all the *light; and while* clinging most distinctly to the words "Christian" and "Unitarian," as meaning the unity of God and the spiritual lordship of Christ, I believe that more truth is yet to come, and that having planted those truths deeply into the earth, we may advance to something higher and better. But I wish to guard myself on this ground. I have often heard the idea of progress dwelt on—I prefer development—for progress gives me the idea of a constant movement and shifting, —a dropping of what we do possess, while grasping for something we do not possess. I have observed that the disciples of progress often leave one Christian truth after another, till they become stranded on a barren Deism. The disciples of progress have been among the worst enemies of Unitarianism. I am a disciple of development; and I believe that the doctrines of the Unity of God and the Messiahship of Christ will flourish, grow up, bud and blossom, in a way which we have never yet seen. I believe that, keeping, as it were, the centre nave of the Unitarian church untouched, we may build cloister and tower and buttress around it, so that the Unitarian church shall become a glorious church, with its doors ever open for the poor, and so beautiful that the richest and noblest will gladly worship there,—a church which will speak of the heaven which is to be, and the glory of Christ in whose honour it was erected.

The general distribution of prizes followed. Rev. Dr. Beard performed this task with expressed and evident pleasure. Of the prizes for proficiency in Biblical History, Geography and Antiquities, liberally offered by Samuel Sharpe, Esq., of London, the first (consisting of books of the value of £3) was awarded to Mr. J. C. Street, and the second to Mr. C. T. Biss. To Messrs. M'Master and W. Robinson, copies of Mr. Sharpe's History of Egypt were given. The names of Messrs. Oates, Robinson and Willicote were also mentioned with honour. Certificates were then publicly given to the three students who had completed their course, viz., Messrs. Street, Robinson and Biss. A brief address from Dr. Beard followed, and the proceedings closed with a prayer by Rev. R. L. Carpenter. The same evening there was conducted in Cross-Street chapel a dedicatory service for the special benefit of students about to undertake pastoral or missionary offices. A large and highly respectable congregation, including many ministers of our church, attended. The introductory and devotional service was impressively conducted by Rev. S. A. Steinthal, of Liverpool, and the address of dedication was delivered to a deeply

attentive congregation by Rev. R. Brook Aspland, of Hackney. By the desire of the Committee of the Home Missionary Board and of all the students of the institution, the address will be printed, and will appear in the next number of our Magazine.

Not the least interesting part of the examination proceedings to the Unitarian public of Manchester is the annual soirée, which this year was held in the Town Hall on the evening of Tuesday, Jan. 24. It was well attended by Unitarian friends drawn from a wide circle around Manchester, and admirably conducted from first to last. We have been supplied with a very full report of the speeches delivered on the occasion, and only regret that we cannot possibly find room for all of them. The chair was taken and its duties excellently performed by J. C. Lawrence, Esq., of London. The speakers were, in addition to the Chairman, Rev. J. T. Whitehead, the Mayor of Manchester, Henry A. Bright, Esq., Rev. Charles Beard, Rev. W. Gaskell, Rev. Brooke Herford, Samuel Greg, Esq., Rev. R. L. Carpenter, Rev. Henry Green, Rev. John Wright, R. Taylor Heape, Esq., Rev. James Drummond and Rev. J. C. Street.

Before giving any of the addresses, we prefix the substance of the Committee's report, which was presented by Rev. James T. Whitehead. It was in its general character cheering and hopeful, and pointed to the results which ensued from the establishment of the College. How far the present widely-spread missionary movement was due to the efforts and influence of the Board would be left for others to determine: but it could at least claim a share in the advantages likely to be derived from the newly-aroused enthusiasm, since without the education provided by it no scheme of missionary labour could be regarded as complete. The report then shewed the stations of all the students who had left the Board. Of these gentlemen, seventeen in all, nine were either missionaries or ministers of societies recently established. The report gave a detailed account of the public work done by the students during the last year, shewing the number of places preached at, the Sunday-school services and addresses, the visits to the sick, &c. &c. One fact shewn in the report was, that frequently students had to conduct services on the same day in places many miles distant; this displayed the insufficiency of the present number of students to do the work. To obviate this difficulty, the Committee hoped that a knowledge of the nature and objects of the Board would be more extensively diffused among young men desirous of engaging in the gospel work. The number of students for the year now closed had been thirteen, three of whom, Messrs. W. Robinson, C. F. Biss and James C. Street, had now completed their course. Mr. Street had accepted an invitation from the Committee of the Manchester District Unitarian Association to become their missionary, and Mr. W. Robinson had been appointed missionary of the East Lancashire Association. Mr. Biss had not yet obtained an appointment. Messrs. Timmins and Whitworth had successfully passed the entrance examinations, and had been entered as students for the ensuing year. The Rev. J. H. Hutton, B.A., had resigned the office of superintendent missionary, and the Revds. John Wright, B.A., and B. Herford had consented to share the duties until a successor could be appointed. Donations of books had been received from various friends during the year. The Committee regretted to add that the Treasurer's account again shewed an excess of expenditure above income, in spite of every effort to avoid unnecessary expense. They would express an earnest hope that the efforts of the Board might not be crippled for the sake of two or three hundred pounds yearly.

Mr. WADSWORTH then read the Treasurer's report, which shewed an income of about £800, against an expenditure of about £1050.

The CHAIRMAN said that the object of the Home Missionary Board was to educate young men for the purpose of becoming missionaries to both town and country. At its commencement fears had been expressed that it would interfere with older institutions, but time had, he believed, dissipated those fears, and the result had shewn that there was a great field which might be usefully occupied by the Home Missionary Board. When he surveyed that field he was struck with the vastness of its extent compared with the smallness of our means. He hoped that the result of this and other similar meetings would be to increase those means. A growing conviction was taking place among thoughtful men that if the great outlying masses of the people should ever be brought under the influence of Christianity, it must be by other instrumentalities than those which supply the wants of cultivated congregations, and of persons who had received early religious training. No one could regard the present aspect of society without feeling that a deep responsibility rested on all who valued their Christian privileges. He trusted that there would be an increased desire on the part of Christian professors to extend the principles which they held so dear. It

could be done only by sending the gospel to the homes of the poor. The work being done by this institution should, he thought, have been done long ago, but it was not too late to begin; and he trusted that the members of our churches would not rest satisfied with sending others to do the work, but would engage in it themselves so far as practicable. Each person could find in his own locality some missionary work which he should do personally. He knew of no greater work. It might be true that there was great satisfaction in commercial enterprize, there was delight in scientific research, but he knew of no joy, no satisfaction, comparable with that of the feeling which sprung up in the mind conscious of influencing mankind for good, conscious of being instrumental in reclaiming men from sin, and bringing back the wandering child to his Heavenly Father. He hoped that this institution would receive increased support, which could not any longer be withheld on the ground of commercial depression. He trusted that those who shared in the present prosperity would remember that they are but stewards of God's bounty, and that they would shew their gratitude to Him by extending as far as they could blessings to those around them.

Ivie Mackie, Esq., moved the adoption of the report. He had pleasure in stating that the balance-sheet of the Home Missionary Board was the only one with which he was connected which did not shew the balance on the right side. He quite agreed with some remarks made by the Chairman about the relation between the present commercial prosperity and the funds of the Board. Manchester was never in such a flourishing state, and it would be a shame if such an institution as this were not properly supported. When it was established five years ago, he had doubts of its success; but his confidence in it had increased every year, and he now looked upon it as one of our established institutions, and one of our best, for it possessed more life and energy than any other. He was glad to think its students and professors were closely united, and that the former in consequence had made much progress. The professors taught the students what they believed to be true, giving the students liberty to exercise their own judgment. In no place was there more liberty than here. The only want was that of money, which he thought would be easy to get. The former students had all turned out satisfactorily, and were doing much to spread our noble principles. A Church-of-England clergyman in Liverpool the other day, speaking in his sermon *of Unitarians, said* that they were a much maligned body and utterly undeserving of the treatment which they usually received. "We are all," said he, "Unitarians; or if we are not, we ought to be." He (the Mayor) had had the fact from one of the clergyman's hearers. He had spent the evening with that clergyman and found him to be really a Unitarian, though professedly a member of the Establishment. After an appeal for funds, the Mayor resumed his seat.

Mr. H. A. Bright, of Liverpool, on seconding the motion, said—I regret that the Committee of the Unitarian Home Missionary Board have been so unkind to you as to ask me to second the resolution. But I am glad that it gives me one more opportunity of publicly identifying myself with Unitarian Christianity on the one hand, and missionary action on the other; and thus identifying myself with the Unitarian Home Missionary Board, which unites those two principles. I believe that this Board is doing a great work and meeting a great want, and I believe that it is chiefly owing to it that the Provincial Assembly has been enabled to take up those plans of missionary action which, I believe, will transform the position of our church in Lancashire and Cheshire, and place it where it ought to be—foremost. I know that objections are being constantly made to the Board. I know, of course, that those objections have been uprooted and weeded out time after time, but I know also that every season there springs up a fresh crop of those chickweeds and groundsels, and so I must spend a moment or two in endeavouring to answer those objections, and shewing why I have confidence in the Unitarian Home Missionary Board. And first, there is what I may call the aristocratic objection to it. It usually takes the form that our body or denomination—for these objectors never use the word "church," but "our body" —has a mission—that is always the word —and this mission is to leaven other denominations, but to leave the poor alone. We are to *leaven* others and subscribe something to a universal church of the future, which may take place or may not, but we shall then have done our work and must die out. But for my part, I very much object to dying out. And I am selfish enough to prefer building a house for myself, to subscribing bricks for somebody else to build a house for himself. And this at least is not selfishness when I say that we are behaving extremely ill, if when the poor man comes to us and asks for the bread of life, and that he may put on the robes of life, we tell him to be clothed and fed elsewhere. When we say

that, we are denying the first principles of Christian truth, and proving as false to our Master as we possibly can. These objectors are taking up ground which has been occupied once and again, and as often abandoned as of no value. They are taking up the ground of the early Platonists. They said, "We are an exclusive set; the common people do not want our principles, they are not fitted for them." And then came the great spirit of Christianity and swept that away. It was not for nothing that our Saviour was a carpenter's son—that the first great fishers of men left their nets to whiten by the sea of Galilee; and if we wish to be a great church, powerful for good, we must sweep all these philosophical differences away, in order that we may bring our religion home to the hearts of the people. And if we do so, we are but doing what other churches do. The Church of Rome has its Franciscans and others to go among the poor. The Church of England says that Oxford and Cambridge cannot supply sufficient workers, and founded St. Bees' and St. Aidan's for men to go among the people. So we are not to keep ourselves in isolation and proud self-satisfaction, which can end only in entire humiliation. I have now another word to say. What are the missionaries to teach? Some take up the Indifferentists' objection to this institution; they say, "Teach people merely to think for themselves, to be free," which is precisely what Mr. Holyoake and the Secularists teach. The young men whom we send out will teach the gospel that is to them Unitarianism. It is the gospel to them, because, on the one hand, it removes the clouds which have hung around our Heavenly Father's face, and shews our Lord as he really was; and, on the other, it prevents them from feeling ground down by mere resistless laws of Nature, without pity or sympathy for those who once have violated them. No great movement, continued Mr. Bright, had ever taken place among the masses, except by theology having been brought to bear upon them. It had been so in Luther's Reformation, and in the case of Christianity itself. The working classes of England could only be moved in this way. It could never be done by pet philanthropies, but in the manner in which John Wesley did it. It would never be done till the masses got true views of what their life is, and their heaven is to be. He wanted to see the religion of Channing brought home to the people with the power of John Wesley. I do believe, said he, that there is in our hands a movement that will alter the whole face of England, and bring together class and class in such a way as had never been done since the first ages of Christianity. It will be so if we be only true to duty. Do any doubt this? Well, then, I say, I know of course that this *may* be all wrong; that all of us *may* be wrong—that we have been building upon hay and stubble and straw which *may* all be swept away—that the indifferentist objectors and the aristocratic objectors *may* be all right; but I care nothing for that. We have a course of duty before us, and whether we succeed or not, we can but perform that duty as God gives us strength to do it. There is a poem of Arthur Clough's; he is describing how the sceptical spirit comes to the hearts of men, and asks them what they know, and why they know, and what is the good of knowledge, and is it not all vain, and what will become of it; and as he speaks, the sensualist says, I know not, let me live my life; and the visionary says, I know not, let me dream my dream; and the philosopher says, I know not, let me think my thought;

> "But when the rest were all o'erpast,
> I know not, I will do my duty, said the last."

Rev. CHARLES BEARD moved the first resolution, the appointment of the officers for the ensuing year. He said that although the list of names placed in his hands was a highly respectable one, it hardly furnished matter of a speech; while he felt that to sit down without further remark would not befit the occasion or be respectful to so important a meeting. The large number of lay names upon the list of officers reminded him of the missionary spirit developed lately in this province, and of the part which the laity had taken in the movement. If he asked, what was the missionary spirit, and what the conditions under which the missionary work could be rightly carried on, the answer to the questions might be larger than he could then give. Thus much he would say, that we were justified in preaching our truth only on the supposition that it was so dear to us, that we could not help preaching it, that it would be a dereliction of duty not to go forth and proclaim it. It would not do to seek to galvanize the half-dead body of a church by missionary effort,—to say that because Independent or Methodist were flourishing and missionary churches, we would adopt the same means to gain the same success. We were in a condition to make such effort only when we felt that the Holy Spirit had given us truth which it would be faithlessness to keep to ourselves. If this, then, were the true missionary spirit, the spirit which animated

the apostles, we should engage in the work personally, not by proxy. It was not for the laity to confine themselves to making subscriptions and electing missionaries. Could any one conceive of St. Paul giving only a pecuniary expression to his zeal for the propagation of the gospel? He (Mr. B.) knew that the claims of business were great, that men had their pet philanthropies and social agencies which might seem to them, and no doubt were, important; but if they properly felt the importance of religious truth, it would so possess their minds and fill their hearts that the claims of business and philanthropic schemes would fade away before it, and some little modicum of time, some small share of energy, would be given to the gospel work. It was of no use for the laymen to say to the ministers, "Go and do our work." Ministers had to do their own work and answer for their own opportunities. If, he continued, you are cold, can you expect that we should burn? If you are dull, listless and indifferent, do you expect us to be perpetual centres of light and heat? If we stand up year after year to preach truths before which all commercial relations and political affairs fade into nothingness, and those to whom we speak seem to take no heed to them, will not our zeal fade away? Mr. Beard concluded with a brief expression of dissent from some of the views of the preceding speaker.

Mr. ROBERT HEYWOOD seconded the motion, which was agreed to.

Rev. WM. GASKELL moved a vote of thanks to the Revds. H. Green and R. L. Carpenter for their services this year at the College examinations. No person but one who had filled such an office could have an adequate idea of the mental strain which it imposed. He had himself held such an office in connection with Manchester New College, and could say that if study was a weariness to the flesh, to examine the results of that study was a weariness also. The thanks of the Home Missionary Board were greatly due to the gentlemen who had undertaken those duties. There was nothing so much desired by Dr. Beard and himself as that the results of their teaching should be thoroughly tested, and he was convinced that Mr. Green and Mr. Carpenter would give a true account of the examination. Their work was not yet completed, it would take another day, but the examiners had given themselves to their duty with great zeal and earnestness; and Mr. Green had made a full report of each examination.

Rev. BROOKE HERFORD seconded the resolution, which was supported by Mr. SAMUEL GREG, and carried unanimously.

Rev. R. L. CARPENTER and Rev. HENRY GREEN replied, each expressing his satisfaction at the results of the examinations.

After a short interval, during which refreshments were handed round, the MAYOR announced that as Treasurer he had just received £25,—£10 from the Chairman, £10 from Mr. Potter, and £5 from other gentlemen.

Rev. JOHN WRIGHT moved that we gratefully acknowledge our obligations to Rev. R. B. Aspland for his kindness in consenting to conduct the dedicatory service to-morrow evening. He was sorry that Mr. Aspland was prevented by a family bereavement from being present at this meeting. Mr. Aspland had been won as a friend of the institution by its success, and he was now willing to come from London to conduct the service which would usher the students to their labour of love. All, he was certain, would join with him in thanking Mr. Aspland for undertaking that office.

Mr. ROBERT TAYLOR HEAPE seconded the resolution, which was carried amid much applause.

Mr. R. M. SHIPMAN moved that the meeting, in taking leave of the students who have finished their course, wishes them success in their future labours.

Rev. JAMES DRUMMOND, B.A., said—It is with peculiar pleasure that I rise to second this resolution. As I have just entered upon the ministerial career, I feel that I can the more readily enter into the spirit of the resolution. The best hope that can be formed for any man is that he may be useful. No matter what may be his department of life, it should surely be our first wish that he act his part faithfully. This naturally leads to the inquiry, what is it to be useful as a Christian minister? What peculiar form of activity is he called into? I conceive that the true function of the Christian preacher is to awaken the moral and spiritual life of his fellow-men. To this all else should be subordinate. It is not his province to advocate a dogma, however true. No man's life is effectually influenced merely through his intellect. In order to make any truth a vital power, we must enter into the heart and soul of that truth, and bring it home to the hearts of others. So long as we merely defend it by ingenious arguments and by refuting those opposed to it, it produces far more of the pride of knowledge than the humility of blindness and ignorance. Truth is infinitely great. The knowledge of it is so wonderful that we must advance to it through eternity. All our expressions for it now are poor and dim and cold. No doubt we have a certain

portion of truth, but it is only a certain portion, and the power with which we enforce it must depend on its power and vitality in our own lives. It is one thing to have strong intellectual convictions, and another thing to have a reverent belief in the heart. So long as belief is confined to the intellect alone, we must remain a lifeless body. I hope that this Home Missionary Board will awaken the sense of new duties among us. And I hope that those going forth will never forget that it is only when their hearts are filled with love, only as they enter into the difficulties of men, that they can hope to bring them to a more vital faith. Let it not be supposed that I am indifferent to doctrine. We wish that those who go forth may be able and accomplished expositors of religious doctrine. For religious doctrine has a practical as well as a religious side. It must be presented in a form that can be accepted by the intellect. But let us remember that our doctrine is temporary, that it is only partially true. We hope that the truth will receive always a higher embodiment; but it is essential to our religious life that we so set forth our opinions that they may be clearly apprehended by others. I am no advocate of sectarian action, if we mean by that only the destruction of the truths or half-truths held by others; but we are bound to give expression to our opinions when we see that others are suffering from theirs. We should then step in and clear away their doubts, and so give the spiritual power a fair chance of being brought to bear on their lives. Mr. Drummond then offered a few remarks on the measure of the minister's usefulness, and concluded by expressing the hope that those students who are now going forth will keep up their zeal—that they will go forth manfully to spread religious life around them—that they will ever possess a deep and thorough conviction that God is actually present in all hearts.

Mr. James C. Street replied on behalf of the students who were leaving the College. He gave an interesting sketch of his early religious history and of the circumstances which led to his connection with the Home Missionary Board, and then said —One effect produced upon us by our studies here has been to make us feel even less fitted to go forth and preach than when we came. We were then, perhaps, a little puffed up, but the result of our curriculum has been to shew us how vast is the field and how small are our powers, how mighty is the work and how weak are the workmen. For myself, I feel humbled to think of my incapacity for the high and honourable work to which I am called in this city. I wish to go forth as a missionary—I wish to go forth as a minister; for I hold that every missionary is a minister, and that every minister ought to be a missionary. There is a field wide enough for all. No man can plead the excuse of want of opportunity. In the great sphere to which you have invited me in Manchester, I shall need the hearty sympathy and co-operation of my beloved tutors, and of all the earnest, true-hearted laymen of the district. There is a great work to be done, and your workman is very feeble. I am sure that I shall have that sympathy and co-operation, and therefore with a feeling of earnestness I trust to enter upon my work. The results I leave in the hands of God.

A vote of thanks to Mr. Lawrence for his conduct in the chair terminated the proceedings.

PROPOSED STATUE OF DR. PRIESTLEY AT OXFORD.

It is some few years since the University of Oxford with becoming liberality granted a sum of £30,000 for the erection of a new Museum. The building, now, we believe, hastening to its completion, if not actually finished, is in the Gothic style. Mr. Ruskin (no mean authority on such a subject) has publicly expressed his approbation of the style adopted. "The aim of the Gothic revivalists," he observes, "is to make art large and publicly beneficial, instead of small and privately engrossed or secluded; to make art fixed instead of portable, associated with local character and historical memory, and to make art expressive instead of curious, valuable for its suggestions and teachings, more than for the mode of its manufacture." The grant of the University was designed simply for the shell of the building. Little was provided in the sum voted, large as it necessarily was, for the ornament of the interior of the Museum. To improve the architectural effect, to make the building itself illustrative of Natural History, and to give to the Museum the most complete efficiency, it is proposed to appeal to individual and public generosity to make certain valuable additions. These include (1) shafts of different kinds of British rocks, useful and ornamental, selected in illustration of Geology. There are 124 of these, and each will cost about £5. (2) Capitols to the shafts and piers illustrating the natural history of various epochs, climates and regions. Of these there are 188, and the cost of this work will be £5 each. (3) Statues of the great founders and improvers of natural knowledge. Of the ancients, the selected names

are Euclid, Archimedes, Hipparchus, Aristotle, Hippocrates, Pliny; of the moderns, Bacon, Galileo, Newton, Leibnitz, Oersted, Lavoisier, Linnæus, Cuvier, Harvey, Hunter, Sydenham, Watt. Of these statues, nine have been already promised, five of which (Bacon, Galileo, Newton, Leibnitz and Oersted) are to be the truly royal gift of Queen Victoria. But in addition to the names primarily adopted, others have been proposed and agreed to; viz., Black, Cavendish, Copernicus, Dalton, Davy, Decandolle, Franklin, Fresnel, Haller, Herschel, Huygens, Jenner, Jussieu, Kepler, Lagrange, Laplace, Morgagni, Priestley, Ray, Volta and Young. (4) Illustrative inscriptions to be worked by the architect into the mouldings or elsewhere.

This great scheme, worthy of the University of Oxford, is entrusted for its execution to a sub-delegacy, consisting of the Rev. Dr. Plumptre, Master of University College; Rev. Dr. Wellesley, Principal of New Inn Hall; Professor Philips and four other gentlemen of University standing and repute.

The admission of the name of Dr. Priestley among the "great founders and improvers of natural knowledge," has happily attracted the attention of some gentlemen alive to his great fame and anxious that every possible honour should be paid to his memory, and in various parts of the kingdom steps have been taken to fulfil this part of the noble design of Oxford delegates.

We have now the pleasure of mentioning that on Wednesday, Feb. 22, a meeting, convened by private circular, was held in the Library at Redcross Street (by permission of the trustees), for the purpose of taking steps to carry into effect the wish entertained in many quarters — that a statue of Priestley should be placed in the Oxford Museum. The large room of the Library was on this occasion adorned by a remarkable collection of portraits and other memorials of the great philosopher. There were the pictures by Opie, by Fuseli, Artauld and by Stewart, the striking medallion by Wedgewood, and two copies of the bust by Hollin. There were also many engraved portraits and printed memoirs of Priestley, covering a large table. Among the gentlemen attending the meeting were Thomas Graham, Esq., F.R.S., &c. &c., Master of the Mint, James Yates, Esq., J. A. Bostock, Esq., J. Ashton Yates, Esq., Rev. J. J. Tayler, T. P. Warren, Esq., Robert A. Wainwright, Esq., Rev. R. B. Aspland, &c. &c. The chair was taken by the Master of the Mint, who, after a few introductory words, called on Mr. Yates to explain the circumstances which had led to the meeting.

Mr. Yates tendered, in the first place, his thanks to the Chairman for his attendance and help. No one was better qualified to represent the interests of science in general, and chemistry in particular. The object for which they were assembled had the concurrent sympathy of others as well as of the eminent friends of science,—of many who regarded Priestley with veneration on account of the wonderful variety of his attainments as well as the virtues of his character. In the extent and variety of his works, Priestley is scarcely surpassed by any name in the history of literature. Many of his works possess extraordinary merit, such as his treatises on perspective, history, oratory and criticism.—The movement which they had met to advance originated with a gentleman of the west of England, Mr. Kent Kingdon, who, recently visiting Oxford, and passing through the new Museum, noticed the name of Priestley on the pedestal of a vacant niche destined for a statue. This led to his making inquiries on the subject, and finding what were the intentions and wishes of the sub-delegacy to whom the decoration of the Museum was entrusted, he entered into communication on the subject with Rev. Wm. Forster. That gentleman took up the subject with all the warmth of zeal, and issued a circular letter on the subject, addressed to and asking the help of all who revered the memory of Priestley. Mr. Forster had at an early period of his action enlisted his (Mr. Yates's) assistance. He had felt very happy to become the Treasurer of the required fund, and since that, all the subsequent action had devolved on him, and by him the meeting now assembled was convened. The proposal to erect a statue to Priestley had naturally interested many gentlemen at Birmingham, and especially Rev. Samuel Bache and Mr. Wm. Hawkes. The latter gentleman, a man of great public spirit and liberality, had taken up the subject very warmly, had collected subscriptions, and had with him (Mr. Yates) become a joint guarantee for the erection of the statue. He was happy to inform the meeting that he had received from Rev. Dr. Plumptre, on behalf of the sub-delegacy, an assurance that the statue of Priestley, if offered on the terms prescribed, would be gladly received and placed in the Museum. Mr. Yates then read a number of letters from Mr. Faraday, Dr. Plumptre, Mr. Roscoe, Mr. W. R. Wood and many other gentlemen, generally expressive of approbation of and interest in the intended work. He also read a long list of subscriptions.

Rev. J. J. Tayler expressed the satisfaction which he felt in being able to take

part in a movement intended to do honour to a man so great and good as Dr. Priestley. Others would gladly have joined that meeting had the opportunity of doing so been given them. He might mention the name of his distinguished colleague, Mr. Martineau, who felt the greatest interest in the proposal, and who would have been with them had he received a summons. For his own part, however he might sympathize with many of Dr. Priestley's other opinions, he was willing to join in this as an expression of reverence for him as a great scientific discoverer. Had Priestley's religious opinions been totally different from what they actually were, he should have felt the greatest pleasure in supporting the proposal now before the meeting.

A long conversation then took place as to the best mode of carrying out the wishes of the meeting. The names of several sculptors were mentioned, and Mr. Stephens and Mr. Peter Slater, two sculptors present, at the request of Mr. Yates offered some observations. Eventually the following resolutions were drawn up and passed:

"That this meeting hears with satisfaction that the Delegacy of the Oxford Museum propose to adorn that building with the statues of the great founders and improvers of natural knowledge, and that amongst the names that of the illustrious Priestley, the father of Pneumatic Chemistry, is included. That in order to carry into effect the wise and liberal suggestion of the Oxford Delegacy, it is desirable that a subscription should be raised in order to procure a statue of Priestley.

"That a Committee be formed to carry this resolution into effect, and that the Committee consist of the following gentlemen, with power to add to their number: The Chairman of this meeting, Mr. James Yates, Mr. Kent Kingdon, Mr. Bostock, Mr. Joseph Parkes, Rev. W. Forster, Mr. E. W. Field, Mr. George Scharf, Rev. J. J. Tayler, Mr. Joseph Taylor.

"That the thanks of this meeting be given to the Trustees of Dr. Williams's Library for the use of the Library to-day, and for their promised use of portraits and models.

"That the thanks of this meeting be given to Robert Wainwright, Esq., the Committee of Manchester New College, Mrs. Bilborough, of Gildersome, Joseph Parkes, Esq., and Mr. Wm. Joseph Taylor, for the use of pictures, medallions and busts, exhibited this day.

"That the thanks of the meeting be given to Mr. James Yates for the steps he has kindly taken in calling and preparing this meeting."

The Chairman having left the chair, it was taken by Mr. Yates, and it was resolved, "That the best thanks of the meeting be given to Mr. Graham for his kindness in taking the chair, and for the ability with which he has discharged its duties."

Mr. Yates (Lauderdale House, Highgate, London) will continue to discharge the duties of Treasurer, and J. A. Bostock, Esq. (54, Chester Square, S.W.), will act as Secretary of the Committee. We rejoice that this plan is now on the high road to what we doubt not will prove a satisfactory conclusion.

PARLIAMENT, EDUCATION, AND THE DISSENTERS.

There has been an interesting debate in each House of Parliament on the subject of education and the right of the children of Dissenters to partake freely of the benefits to be derived from the national educational establishments. In the Lower House, Mr. Pollard-Urquhart raised the subject by moving an Address to the Crown on the subject of the illiberal statutes prepared by the authorities of Trinity and St. John's College, Cambridge. The motion was not productive of any result beyond the utterance of several speeches, and especially one from Lord Stanley, which rather indicated that the spirit of Parliament was in advance of that of the University of Cambridge. It was argued that the powers of the University Commissioners were limited, and that the object sought by the motion of Mr. Pollard-Urquhart could only be attained by a modification by Parliament itself of the Act of Uniformity. When shall we have a Ministry and a Parliament willing to enter on this ground, so perilous to the interests of an Established Church? We may mention that in several cases petitions designed to support Mr. Pollard-Urquhart's motion were prepared, but, owing to the short notice given of the intended debate, were not forwarded in time.—In the Upper House, the subject of the admission of the children of Dissenters to public grammar-schools was discussed in relation to Lord Cranworth's Bill respecting Endowed Schools. We state the result and some judicious comments in the words of a recent number of the *Manchester Guardian*:

"The aim of Lord Cranworth's Endowed Schools Bill has been the promotion of a more liberal administration of the old educational foundations of this country; but, although the House of Lords has agreed to the clause by which the trustees of schools not founded for the peculiar benefit of the Church of England are required to

admit the children of Dissenters, it has condemned that other important clause, the object of which was to empower Dissenters to act as trustees of such schools. In fact, therefore, as it now stands, the Bill will do little to satisfy the demands of the Dissenters, whose children are already admitted into a large proportion of the principal existing schools, and are exempted from instruction in the Catechism and other formularies of the Establishment. It is to the House of Commons that Dissenters must look for the changes which we believe they have a right to demand. And not only the office of trustees, but also of masters, of the majority of our endowed schools, ought to be thrown more widely open. On this point we desire to draw attention to a suggestion that the graduates of London, Durham, and the Scotch and Irish Universities should be rendered eligible for appointment to masterships in many cases where alumni of Oxford and Cambridge have hitherto been the only available candidates. It is but just that all our Universities should be placed on an equality in this matter, when it is remembered that in the majority of the cases in which the two older seats of learning are specified in foundation-deeds as the places whence masters are to be derived, the union with Scotland and Ireland had not taken place, and the Universities of London and of Durham had not been founded. Moreover, it was virtually promised to the London University, by the terms used at its foundation, that its graduates should be placed on an equality with those of the ancient Universities. We shall be glad to see some Liberal member of the House of Commons bring this matter under discussion in Parliament. Our endowed grammar-schools were founded, for the most part, either by Edward VI. of pious memory, or by persons who desired to forward the cause of learning at the dawn of the Reformation, in order that men might study the Scriptures for themselves in 'Ye Latin tongue.' Their aim was to further the cause of Protestant liberty, at a time when Protestantism was, so to speak, itself Dissent; and surely the spirit, if not the letter, of their origin demands perfect catholicity in their administration. The English grammar-schools, after long years, during which their endowments have been perverted and misappropriated, are now in process of revival throughout the country. May they all be restored to their true vocation, and may they be restored on a catholic basis, so that Dissenters, as well as members of the Church of England, may derive from them full and lasting advantages!"

CHURCH-RATES.

The alarm and consequent organization of the Church party on this subject have produced a swarm of petitions to Parliament adverse to liberal legislation on it. Sir John Trelawny has carried the second reading of his Bill against a vigorous and united opposition. The Bill is not to go into Committee until March 28th. It is desirable that petitions should be immediately prepared and sent up by all who desire the entire abolition of Church-rates. The form of petition which follows is that recommended by the Liberation Society:

"To the [Right Honourable the Lords Spiritual and Temporal] or [the Honourable the Commons] of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled.

"The humble Petition of the undersigned [as the case may be]—

"Sheweth,—That your Petitioners are informed that there is a Bill now before your [Right] Honourable House, by which it is proposed that Church-rates should be abolished.

"That your Petitioners are also informed that in stead thereof, and in opposition to said Bill, it has been proposed to exempt Dissenters from the payment of Church-rates, but to continue to force Episcopalians to pay for their own religious worship.

"Your Petitioners therefore beg most respectfully to inform your [Right] Honourable House that they desire no exemption from any duty properly incumbent on them as citizens, but they think that no citizen ought to be compelled by law to pay for any religious worship whatever.

"And they humbly pray your [Right] Honourable House to pass the Bill for abolishing Church-rates with as little delay as may be.

"And your Petitioners will ever pray, &c."

BIRMINGHAM UNITARIAN BROTHERLY SOCIETY.

At the annual meeting of the above Society, held in the room at the back of the Old Meeting-house, Old Meeting Street, on Tuesday evening, February 14th, 1860, the following report was read by Mr. Reuben Edmunds:

The number of pupils in the Unitarian Sunday-schools in Birmingham at the present time, 1543. Course of instruction—reading, writing, arithmetic, religious culture, dictation, grammar and composition, imparted by 309 teachers; increase, 9. Volumes in Libraries, 10,438; increase, 231. Number of pupils depositing their savings with the schools, 727; increase, 140. Amount deposited, £439. 10*s.* 8*d.*;

increase, £77. 15*s.* 7*d.* during the past year. In connection with the Brotherly Society and Sunday-schools is the old-established Benefit Society, now in its sixty-second year, which, besides providing gratuitous surgical attendance, allows to those members who have been subscribers five years at 4*d.* per week the unprecedented sum of 18*s.* per week in case of illness. Number of subscribers to the Benefit Society, 498: increase, 5. Amount received by subscriptions to Benefit Society, £246. 10*s.* 6*d.*; increase, £15. 8*s.* 3*d.* Amount received by interest on capital, £266. 11*s.* 1*d.* Amount paid for surgical attendance, illness and deaths, £342. 1*s.* 5*d.*, being an increase of £94. 8*s.* 7*d.* over 1858. Total capital of the Brotherly Benefit Society, £5998. 7*s.* 1*d.*; increase during the past year, £171. 0*s.* 2*d.*

OBITUARY.

Jan. 30, in her 83rd year, Mrs. Bischoff, widow of the late James Bischoff, Esq., of Highbury Terrace.

Feb. 4, at Esthwaite How, near Windermere, in her 55th year, Jane, wife of Mr. T. Lindsey Aspland. To the memory of this estimable and gifted lady, a friend desires the opportunity of offering a brief tribute.

The characteristic of her mind and character was, that it was adjusted to the nicest moral balance. Gifted by nature with good sense, warm affections, and an equability and sweetness of temper seldom surpassed, she added to these natural characteristics truthfulness and a beautiful simplicity of manners. In the domestic circle her cheerfulness, friendly sympathy and ready kindness diffused constant sunshine around her. Her religious convictions were those of Unitarian Christianity, and they were such as accorded with and gave happy exercise to the natural convictions of her understanding and the affections of her heart. After her marriage, she, in conjunction with her husband, cultivated art as a profession, which she had previously regarded simply as an accomplishment. As an artist, her works reflected some of the qualities of her mental and moral constitution. She was a careful and discriminating observer of nature, and her pictures were beautifully truthful representations of what she saw. Her choice of subjects was largely influenced by her own bright and cheerful mind. Residing during the latter years of her life in the midst of the exquisite scenery of the English Lakes, her natural taste became more and more refined, and her practical skill as a painter was rapidly developed. Devoted to an art which she loved, and to the cultivation of which her peculiarly happy domestic relations and her place of residence were eminently favourable, her life glided on with as few drawbacks from happiness as ordinarily fall to the lot of human beings. About three years ago she was visited by severe and sudden illness. Recently her friends were indulging the hope that she had rallied from its effects, when another attack, similar in kind but more severe in degree, after a few days of anxious struggle with disease, brought her life to a close. The cheerful and hospitable abode of Esthwaite How, which her virtues and talents had made attractive to many, and inexpressibly dear to the chosen companion of her life, is by this event made a place of unspeakable sorrow. Her departure is sincerely mourned, not by relatives only, but by many friends, and especially by humble neighbours who often needed her kind assistance, and seldom sought it in vain.

Feb. 8, at her residence, Flowery Field, Hyde, near Manchester, in her 74th year, Harriot, widow of the late Thomas Ashton, Esq.

Mrs. Ashton was a native of the village of Mottram, about three miles from Hyde, and came to reside in the latter place at the time of her marriage, in the first years of the present century. The site of the flourishing town which now furnishes employment for nearly 20,000 inhabitants, was then occupied by no more than a few scattered houses, and the only centre of population was the village which clustered round the old Presbyterian meeting-house at Gee Cross. This great social change has been in great part owing to the commercial enterprize and ability of one or two families of worshipers at the last-named place, among whom the husband of the lady whose death we now record occupied, together with his brother, a prominent position. To speak of Mr. Thomas Ashton to those who are at all acquainted with the history of the cotton manufacture during the present century would be a superfluous task; it is sufficient here to say that he was unwearied in his efforts to promote the welfare both of his own work-people and of his native place at large. In all these labours he was greatly aided by the cheerful energy and unwearied benevolence of his wife. To her kindness it was impos-

sible for want or sickness to make a vain appeal. Her generous hospitality, which made her house a point of contact for social circles which might otherwise have remained apart, embraced the poor as well as the rich within its kindly sphere. She never forgot an old friend, even though she possessed a power, remarkable in one of her age, of making new ones. Her goodness was as thoughtful and unselfish as it was prompt; she said a kind word or did a liberal act with a delicacy and justness of feeling which made them doubly kind and liberal. Many of her charities are unknown except to the recipients of them, for she delighted "to do good by stealth." But the reckoning is laid up with God.

Of her domestic relations, of the singular success with which she discharged the duties of a wife and a mother, this is hardly the place to speak. The full beauty of the reality can be known only to those to whom these memorial words will throughout appear cold and indistinct, and whose sense of loss would be embittered by any intrusion into recesses sacred only to regretful love. During a fifteen years' widowhood, Mrs. Ashton's object in life seemed to be to fill as far as possible the place of a husband whom she held in deep and deserved respect. The extent to which she succeeded may be measured by the universal sorrow caused by her death. Her sympathies, active to the last, her lively interest in all matters of public and private import, her strong sense and practised judgment, gave her an influence rarely gained by one of her sex and age. She was as apt to engage the love of the young as to retain the respect of the old, and entered with unfailing ardour into the hopes and plans of those who were only upon the threshold of life. Among the friends who were admitted to her most unreserved confidence, and to whom her death is a heartfelt sorrow, are some who have known her only in the decline of life and are younger than her own children.

Mrs. Ashton was throughout her married life a regular attendant at Hyde chapel, Gee Cross, and took the deepest interest in the prosperity of the congregation which assembles in that place. There she will be missed as one of a generation of sincere and consistent worshipers now almost passed away, and especially as a friend who never spared either personal or pecuniary effort for any good work. Once more, this is not the place to speak of the patience and Christian humility with which she bore a long and painful illness, one of the chief trials in connection with which was that she was debarred during many months from attendance upon public worship. She was quietly, almost unexpectedly, released from her sufferings on the morning of February 8th, and interred at Hyde chapel on the following Tuesday by the minister of the place. C.

Feb. 8, at the Parsonage, Cirencester, Rev. FREDERICK HORSFIELD. He had been minister at the Presbyterian chapel of Cirencester nearly forty years; but death, removals and other causes had reduced the congregation to the lowest possible ebb. What has taken place at Cirencester is a proof of the mischief that may result from a minister's being put into the list of trustees of the chapel at which he officiates.

Feb. 13, suddenly, aged 26, JOSEPH TUCKERMAN, second son of John FRANCIS, Esq., of Edgbaston, near Birmingham.

Feb. 14, aged 6 years, CHARLES, son of Benjamin HEAPE, Esq., of Polefield House, Prestwich, Manchester.

Feb. 16, at Bury St. Edmunds, in his 91st year, THOMAS ROBINSON, Esq., a magistrate for the county of Suffolk. His public services had for many years been lost to the community, the consequence of continued ill health, but they were respectfully remembered.

Feb. 17, at Newton Hall, near Leeds, FRANCES HANNAH, wife of Arthur LUPTON, Esq.

MARRIAGES.

Jan. 3, at the Unitarian church, Swansea, by Rev. Edward Higginson, Mr. WM. POWELL GLOVER to ELIZABETH, youngest daughter of John WILLIAMS, Esq., of the *Cambrian* newspaper.

Feb. 9, at the Unitarian church, Swansea, by Rev. Edw. Higginson, Mr. FRANK JOLLY, of Bath, to ANN FRANCES, second daughter of John WILLIAMS, Esq., of the *Cambrian* newspaper.

Feb. 14, at the Elder-Yard chapel, Chesterfield, GEORGE, eldest son of Mr. George BROOMHEAD, of the *Derbyshire Courier*, to MARY, eldest daughter of Mr. George NORTH, all of Chesterfield.

Feb. 19, at the Unitarian chapel, Swinton, by Rev. B. Glover, Mr. JAS. COLLIER to Miss SARAH ANN WORTHINGTON, and Mr. MILES BARKER to Miss MARGARET CROOK, all of Swinton.

THE CHURCH OF
THE SAVIO
BELLE VUE PARK
SOUTHAMPTON
NORTH AISLE
CHANCEL
DRAWN & ETCHED ON STEEL BY THE ARCHITEC

THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CLXXXIV.] APRIL, 1860. [Vol. XVI.

GEORGE HARRIS: A MEMOIR. BY JOHN GORDON.

Chapter I.

THE MAN AND HIS WORK.

It was on Thursday, July 13, 1843, that I saw the late Mr. Harris for the first time. I was then residing at Coventry. Mr. Harris had been, I believe, conducting some public service at Birmingham, and he came over to Coventry to make my acquaintance. I had been for some years an Unitarian minister, and I knew Mr. Harris very well by reputation, but I had not before had an opportunity of meeting him. He was at that time the minister of St. Mark's chapel, Edinburgh. He came over to me spontaneously, without any invitation on my part, in the indulgence of that open disposition which ever led him to expect a friend in a professor of his own religious faith. He introduced himself to me with the utmost frankness of address. I feel the warm grasp of his hand this moment as I write,—a grasp with which, till that hand was powerless, he ever afterwards welcomed me. I thought, when I looked upon him that morning, that he was the handsomest man I had ever seen. His face and figure were as beautiful as they were manly. Alas! how the remembrance of this vision smote me with a sense of earthly changeableness when I saw him in his coffin and could hardly recognize the features I had so much admired! A small party of friends from Birmingham had accompanied him on this visit, and we immediately arranged to spend the day in the neighbourhood, and return home to dinner in the evening. It was the perfection of a day for our excursion. We visited Kenilworth and Warwick, going over Warwick Castle as I especially remember, and all the time was passed in that kind of converse which makes men to know each other as they are. Pleasant was the social meal with which the day's adventures were closed; and when we parted at night, it was with a conviction, on my side, that the brotherhood of life had been enlarged.

During the course of that happy day I gained a clear idea of Mr. Harris's character, the truth of which subsequent knowledge only confirmed.

I found him to be a most genial man. His coming to me as he did, indicated this, and his whole behaviour confirmed it. His

strong human sympathy continually manifested itself, and it constituted, as I afterwards discovered, one of the chief means of his influence. He could vividly appreciate the humanity of a man. "What I was most particularly struck with during all our acquaintance," says Mr. George Hope, of Edinburgh, who knew him well, "was that every time I saw him he asked after every person connected with our body. He lost sight of none, rich or poor."

In connection with his geniality of temper, our first intercourse brought out prominently his intense love of nature. This was quite a passion with him, and no one could truly estimate what he was who had not been his companion amid scenes of beauty and grandeur. An observation or two which he dropped relating to a comparison between the scenery round Warwick Castle and that round Dalkeith Palace came forcibly to my remembrance, when I visited the latter place years after, as an instance of that rare faculty which can discover the mind and heart lying under the face of a landscape. One of my correspondents, when saying, in testimony of his fond and hearty admiration of the beauties of nature, that "he liked to walk and talk among them and to have companions of his joy and sympathizers," adds, very characteristically, "he liked to preach against Calvinism and the curse in beautiful situations." "In his old age," said Mr. Crosskey, "when I wandered with him by the mountain loch, he enjoyed its beauty with the freshness of a young lad upon whom the glory had first dawned."

But these and all other natural qualities of the man were thrown into the shade by that attachment to Unitarianism which was soon perceived to be the ruling principle of his life. Seventeen years ago, Unitarianism had a fresher though not a deeper interest with me than it has now, and the path which it opened to its friends was a plainer path than it opens now. There were circumstances, too, just happening at the time of which I am speaking, that added to the general interest of the subject a particular interest of their own. Upon that subject—its nature and its prospects—he entered with the enthusiasm which befitted an apostle of the cause. His whole mind and soul and spirit were in that cause. It was his joy to spend himself and to be spent for it. He had no shadow of a doubt about its truth and value, and no hesitation as to devoting to its work all the energies he possessed.

I have heard it said that he admired and loved Christianity, but *adored* Unitarianism; and there might have been truth in the declaration if he had made the distinction on which it was based. That distinction, however, he did not and could not make. With Unitarianism he identified his highest conceptions of Christianity. It was to him true Christianity as distinguished from everything besides. He willingly conceded the privileges

of a Christian belief to those who held Christianity in other forms, but he did so on the ground that the belief was theirs, not his. He never thought that because his disbelief was the belief of others, he might place himself in the same Christian relation to what he believed and to what he disbelieved. He conscientiously preserved his own integrity in the case, and therefore gave the full religious assent of his intellect and heart to that which he esteemed the gospel of God in Christ, when it did not agree with the general opinion on the subject, as well as when it did.

Had his Unitarianism been mainly of a controversial character, it ought not to have occupied the Christian position I have represented it as sustaining, and I have no doubt that many people were persuaded that it was of that character only. This was a great mistake. The testimonies I have received to the positive form of his administration are as remarkable as anything about him which has come under my notice. Thus speaks Mr. M'Kean, of Oldbury,—a man who is well known for his pertinacious attachment to liberty and love as the sum and substance of the gospel, and whom Mr. Harris drew into his present religious associations:—"He has been represented as a mere destroyer of orthodoxy, but this is most untrue. As the promulgator of a positive belief, he was more eminent than any preacher I have since heard. His great theme was the Fatherhood of God, as distinguishing Unitarianism from Judaism, Mahometanism and Deism. He always shewed that the Unity alone was not our distinguishing point, but was common to us and others. The Paternity was Christ's revelation. They who suppose he was a great controversialist, and that fighting with religious falsehood was his forte, forget that he had many errors to expose, and but one truth to establish. But never did he forget that one truth, but bore it as his standard into the thickest of the fray. His glowing and glorious descriptions of the renovated world converted from strange gods and united in the adoration of parental love, can never cease to be remembered by those who heard them. I learned from him to lay hold of the one great principle, 'one God and Father of all,' as a truth indubitable as the laws of attraction and repulsion, and universal in its application to spiritual beings as those laws are to the physical universe."

Courage and determination especially distinguished his efforts on behalf of the religious cause to which he attached himself. Mr. Crosskey hit the nail on the head when he chose for the text of the sermon he preached in Glasgow on occasion of Mr. Harris's death, the words, "A good soldier of Jesus Christ," and he did well when he thus applied the text to his subject:—"His was not the calm and meditative mind which mirrors within its serene depths the mysteries of the heavens above and the quiet

light of the stars, and ponders over each grace and each beauty undisturbed by passionate tumults. His mind was not a mirror to reflect, but a sword wherewith to fight. He had not the calm characteristics of the scholar, who, pent within his study, frees himself from all parties, observes all battles but plunges into none, examines and judges the ways of the world rather than mingles with the busy crowd, but he had the eagerness of the warrior longing for the fray. He had not the genius of the discoverer and extended not the boundaries of human knowledge, but he fought for the authoritative establishment of ascertained results. . . . . The warrior preacher had the warrior's characteristic features. You could not daunt him. His spirit rose with the storm. His full powers were never shewn until you insulted and reviled him. Not simply a soldier, but a captain, he was not born to submit. Self-reliant, resolute, decisive, he could command those beneath him better than he could follow. . . . . A gallant captain, captain of an advanced guard, he sought the foremost place. He delighted to pioneer the way. He dreaded no odds. No man imagines that George Harris would have been other than delighted had the whole clergy of this land set upon him as one man, and sought to annihilate him outright. He would have been the happier the more numerous his foes, and would have defied them all. Gallant captain of an advanced guard, he felt certain of victory."

In all my intercourse with Mr. Harris, I was particularly struck with the manner in which his religious faith gave form and character to his opinions on all subjects of human interest. A stronger evidence of the positive nature of that faith could not exist. Discover in what direction a full trust in the benevolence of God would lead a man, and in that path you would be sure to find him travelling, and that to its utmost length, without hesitation or compromise. This made him, in civil, ecclesiastical and social matters, the ultra-liberal that he was, and imparted a kind of intuition to his appreciation of that side of any question on which he was likely to rank himself. His religious instincts always marked out for him his distinctive position. This point is thus touched by Mr. R. B. Aspland in the admirable Funeral Sermon which has lately been published: "All his ideas, all his aspirations, sprung directly from the religious system which he had adopted. He found it equal to every want of his mind and heart. He could conceive nothing intellectually more congenial to his understanding. He wanted no other or higher philosophy than the New Testament, as he read it, could supply. Hence he drew all his notions of right and wrong, and he was prepared to apply them to man individually and collectively. His views of political as of moral truth rested upon the same foundation." The effect of this was a unity of purpose throughout the length and breadth of life which very few men are seen to possess.

It was some considerable time after my first introduction to Mr. Harris that I obtained any personal knowledge of him in his public capacity. Of his great oratorical power I had frequently been told, but it was not till 1848 that I witnessed any specimen of it. I heard him then deliver one of his most telling speeches. It will be abundantly shewn in the course of my narrative that his influence over a popular audience was almost unrivalled. In indignant denunciation, sweetness of description, and pathetic appeal, he was equally successful. I do not intend to anticipate here what I shall afterwards have to bring forward on this subject, but I cannot refrain from saying, that the greatest public triumph I ever witnessed on his part was when he himself retired into the least prominent position on the scene of his glory. I refer to the services at the opening of the beautiful chapel which he had been the means of erecting at Newcastle-upon-Tyne. On that occasion he delegated to others the most honourable places in the work to be done, and yet every one felt, throughout the whole proceedings, that to him the chief honour belonged. What part he took in those proceedings was discharged with a quiet, unpretending, subdued simplicity which singularly contrasted with the bold antagonism commonly attributed to him; and to my dying day I trust I shall never lose the deep religious impression which his sacramental address produced on me. For matter, a child might have spoken it; and for manner, everything was lost sight of but the Great Master whose spiritual presence it realized.

I am naturally led to say here that there was in Mr. Harris a remarkable freedom from everything like jealousy of others. He knew his own power, and did not hesitate to assume the station to which that power entitled him. He put himself forward to do the work which he was conscious he could do better than the rest. But he neither undervalued his brethren in comparison with himself, nor stood in the way of any man's legitimate influence. He did not entertain an exaggerated opinion of his special capabilities, and what he thought could be best entrusted to other hands he generously insisted in placing there. He had a peculiar talent for drawing out the resources of those with whom he was connected, so as to reveal to them means of usefulness of whose possession they were not previously aware, and he never withheld full commendation from the merit he appreciated. It was astonishing to see how he found the right place for every man and put him into his place. The question he asked was, how could the work on which he had set his heart be most effectively prosecuted, and he formed his judgment and exercised his sympathies according to the claims of that work, and not according to the interests of his personal honour. This freedom from jealousy was not only remarkable in its degree, but remarkable in itself, as it is opposed to the temptations under which great popularity places a man.

There was another effect of the temptations incident to popularity from which Mr. Harris was strikingly freed. He never neglected the practical details of business by absorbing his attention in efforts of public display. He was as careful to secure success by a minute supervision of necessary arrangements, as by his preparations for eloquent utterance. His faculty for organization was indeed wonderful. I have often admired it, as I admire the constructive power which natural history attributes to instinct, feeling the kind of inferiority which one does when contemplating the architecture and economy of a bee-hive. I have heard that a Calvinistic newspaper published in Paisley gives him credit for being the first to introduce into Scotland those large religious tea-meetings that are now so common among all sects. "There can be but one opinion of his zeal," says a correspondent, with a feeling truly befitting the case, "earnest, warm and even childish; and when I say childish I use the word advisedly, for with his anxiety there was a simplicity in which all he did was conducted that one with a little of the world's guile would not have stooped to. How delightful it is to look back upon the preliminaries and arrangements for soirées and such things! He used to go heart and soul into them, calculating to a lump of sugar or an apple or orange in carrying through his labours of love." In planning excursions, which he sometimes did so as to provide for the accommodation and pleasure of large parties during journeys of great length and variety, he would by personal inspection fully acquaint himself with the ground to be traversed, that he might adopt an order of procedure by which every possible advantage could be secured; and in carrying out his design he would so watch over and direct the business that the result answered the expectation as exactly as a piece of mechanism might be made to fulfil its purposes. I recollect on one of my visits to Newcastle that he and his people had been disappointed in obtaining the use of a hall on which he had depended for holding a public meeting. He immediately engaged another hall of a superior kind; but it had to be fitted up for his purpose in a time exceedingly short. He rose very early on the morning of the day of meeting, and spent many hours in directing and aiding the work to be done. I saw him in the middle of the day working like a common upholsterer. He returned home at the last moment, having barely time to change his dress before the public proceedings commenced. I could not help smiling at the contrast between the industrial appearance with which he went up to his chamber, and the finished clerical habit in which he very shortly descended from it. I could not but admire the dignity with which he conducted the business of the meeting afterwards, as contrasted with the manual service to which he had previously devoted himself; and I felt more disposed to pay him reverence as a true bishop of his flock for this earnest exercise of every aptitude for overlooking the interests of that

flock, than if I had witnessed alone the princely manner in which the special functions of his office were discharged.

The sketch I have traced may serve as a rude attempt at a likeness of the man whose biography I am about to undertake. I always think a biographical work very incomplete when it is not accompanied with a portrait of its subject; and I am in the habit of continually turning from the written narrative to the engraved resemblance when I have the means of doing so. I like to fancy how the face looked under the different influences which the story of the life describes. Perhaps what I have said may help a reader like myself to call up what may stand in the stead of the living presentment by which he is accustomed to explain and apply what he reads. Certainly I have had no intention of formally depicting Mr. Harris's character. What I have done in this way has arisen unpremeditatedly from the simple fact of my beginning to speak of him at the point when my actual acquaintance with him commenced. I have been drawn along till I have thought it best to make this first chapter introductory to any consecutive detail of facts; and in continuing it upon this principle for a little further space, I will add to the personal description I have given a few remarks on the position Mr. Harris occupied in that department of the religious world to which he distinctively belonged.

Unitarianism, or rather that general ecclesiastical movement which includes the progress of Unitarianism, has passed through three separate stages.

The first was the old English Presbyterian stage. Its great characteristic was not anything in the nature of doctrinal opinion, but the application of freedom to the interpretation of Christianity. This freedom gradually produced an Arian belief among those on whom it operated; but theological speculation was, for the most part, kept in entire subserviency to the exposition of Christian morality. The scattered Unitarian publications of a previous time had, no doubt, a considerable influence upon this Arian period; but its peculiarities were the natural effect of that softening of orthodox rigour which freedom occasioned, rather than the adoption of any heretical system of theology. The connection of this period with modern Unitarianism does not lie in the fact of its expressing Unitarian conclusions, although they may be more or less distinctly traced almost from the beginning of it, but in the fact of its preparing the way for the reception of those conclusions. It was among the body thus prepared that Unitarianism afterwards chiefly prevailed. A movement thus varied and changeable cannot be represented by one individual. It includes among its representatives both Dr. Williams and Dr. Lardner, though the first was orthodox and the second was a Humanitarian. If we could strike an average of the qualities of these two men, we might

perhaps come nearer to a type of the class to which they belonged than by selecting any real person from among that class.

Dr. Priestley was undoubtedly the true representative of the second Unitarian period I have to notice. He was a strict Humanitarian, who attached to his theological views the highest importance, and held himself ready to defend them against all comers. The unmistakeable clearness with which he declared his opinions, and the unwearied persistency with which he urged them upon others,—his transparent honesty, his scientific reputation, his conscientious industry, his philosophical consistency,—this combination of qualities gave him great influence over those who were at all fitted to receive his views. Among Dissenters of the liberal and cultivated classes, this influence was especially manifested, and thus the old Presbyterian body became leavened with a distinct Unitarianism. This, however, is to be specially remembered as characteristic of the development under review, that though it was intensely controversial, the controversy was mainly a written one. The preaching of those who followed its tendencies was but slightly tinged with doctrine, being perhaps more decidedly ethical than that of the Arian period. The congregation was understood to meet for moral improvement alone, and it was in the relation of its members to the religious world without that its theological character was made most fully apparent. There was also a prevalent persuasion to the effect that the mass of the people were not fitted for the acceptation of the form of Christianity believed, and education far more than anything like missionary effort was relied upon for spreading the belief.

The third period may be described as the Missionary one. It was a period in which strenuous attempts were made to popularize the Unitarianism of the Priestley school, and during which that form of Unitarianism underwent such changes as its adaptation to popular use necessitated. The late Robert Aspland must be honoured as the leader of this movement. He originated the Monthly Repository; he formed the Unitarian Association; he projected direct missionary operations; he fostered every popular agency; he set the example of the method to be pursued in spreading Unitarianism by his own preaching and labours. Others followed him in this course, so that his name only stands first among a list of worthy compeers. Under their influence, Unitarian preaching assumed a more directly doctrinal character, and a system of lecturing was generally resorted to for the purpose of bringing its doctrines within the knowledge of the public. One palpable effect of this procedure was to elevate the administration of Unitarianism above the controversial position it had previously occupied. It became more positive in its religious statements and applications. It was no longer employed for the confutation of error alone or chiefly; but it addressed itself to

the utterance of the specific truth it embraced. In the church it substituted for mere ethical discussion and appeal that emphatically Christian teaching which harmonized with its theology, and it stood before the world ready to interpret and advance on its principles every interest of humanity. If Mr. Aspland was the head of this movement, Richard Wright was its principal missionary, and George Harris was its great popular preacher. No other man can compare with him in that respect, and he fulfilled this office in a manner as illustrious in itself as it was superior to the pretensions of others. This is, as I judge, his true place among his contemporaries and coadjutors. It is this which gives him an importance beyond that conferred by any personal qualities he possessed. This made him in his peculiar sphere a representative man. It is in this light I propose to regard him, and thus, by his means, to give some idea of the significance and value of that phase of Unitarian history with which he was connected.

We may thus be able to gather from the past some lessons that may be useful for our guidance both as to the present responsibilities pressing upon us, and the anticipations in which we may indulge with regard to the future. We seem now to have entered, or to be entering, upon a fourth period of Unitarian history. It would be foolish to characterize events passing before us, and in whose progress we are taking part, as though we could estimate them in their results; but no one acquainted with Unitarian affairs can fail to see that there is now a prevalent disposition to sink all the peculiarities of Unitarian belief in the indulgence of a sympathy with the general liberal tendency of cultivated religious society. We hear it argued that the Unitarian controversy has lost its interest; that its distinctive points are of little importance; that the proper work of Unitarians is being better done by persons who make no open profession of Unitarianism; that the modifications which orthodoxy has undergone do not leave it open to the charges formerly preferred against it; and that corresponding modifications on the Unitarian side should be sought for and encouraged. These and similar views have produced a change of attitude and feeling among us, and indicate changes yet to come. On the other hand, there is a remarkable revival of the missionary spirit in Unitarian communities, and a general strengthening and extension of their organizations, which, along with other circumstances, develop a different tendency of thought and purpose. That movement is as prevalent in our circle as is the broad-church movement just referred to. I believe that the facts connected with Mr. Harris's biography will contribute something toward a just estimate of both these tendencies, and may be made the means of turning the experience of the third period of our history to some useful result in the period which constitutes the sphere of our responsibilities.

SCRIPTURAL HYMNS. By SIR JOHN BOWRING.

No. XIV.

"Holier than thou" (Isaiah lxv. 5).

"STAND by! stand by! for I am holier
Than thou," said the proud Pharisee.
Let me be lowly, Lord! and lowlier
Whene'er approaching THEE.

Approaching Thee—presumptuous word!
For to approach the farthest star
Is but a step tow'rds Thee, the Lord
Immeasurably far.

Yes! infinitely low HE bends
To reach the stars—and how divine
The heavenly grace that condescends
To look on earth, benign!

Thine is that grace, benignant One!
And yet the humblest of our race
May turn him tow'rds Thy highest throne,
And share that heavenly grace.

No. XV.

"The heavens declare the glory of God" (Psalm xix. 1).

O MARVELLOUS book! whose everlasting pages
Were opened first at Heaven's primeval nod,
And are revealed from ages unto ages,
The autographs indelible of God.

And these declare His never-dimning glory
From day to day in highest eloquence,—
From night to night an intellectual story,
Speaking in every tongue to every sense.

Like a proud bridegroom, see the Sun advances
In strength and greatness in his onward race,
Light round his footsteps, splendour in his glances,
And seeks no rest, nor needs a resting-place.

He sinks at evening—but, refreshed, arises
At the next dawning; neither cloud nor storm
Arrests his onward progress, nor surprises
His march majestical and uniform.

And as when first flung forth by the Creator,
Still shall he shine until creation die;
Lamp of revolving worlds,—life's renovator,—
A centre of celestial harmony!

THE ULSTER REVIVAL OF 1859.*

HAVING already adverted at sufficient length to the origin, progress and prevailing spirit of the religious agitation which has been denominated the Ulster Revival of 1859, we have only, before closing our remarks, to make a few statements respecting the results which have flowed from it.

One is of a very melancholy kind,—the loss of a number of valuable lives, which have fallen a sacrifice to bodily and mental disease resulting from the highly-wrought excitement occasioned by the movement. Of such melancholy occurrences several have been made known to us; and from the casual manner in which they have come to our knowledge, we have little doubt that a great many more must have taken place, though at present unknown to us. It is remarkable that in all the cases of which we have heard in which the excitement of revivalism was followed by death, the victims were persons who had occupied a respectable station in life, and had received educational advantages far superior to those which had been enjoyed by the great majority of the converts.

One was the minister of a Presbyterian congregation in a district which was visited by the spiritual epidemic in the course of the summer. He was favourable to the movement and did his utmost to promote it; nor is there any doubt that, in so doing, he conceived that he was performing a solemn duty incumbent on him as a minister of religion, helping forward what he sincerely believed to be the "work of God." His pulpit services became more solemn, more vehement and more energetic than they had ever previously been. Prayer-meetings occupied a large proportion of his time. When "cases" such as we have described in our former articles began to occur among his people and in his neighbourhood, he made it his business to visit the sufferers, to pray with them, to read to them, to sing hymns with them, and to soothe or alarm their consciences as circumstances appeared to require. In such avocations he frequently spent the greater part of the day and the whole night. Gradually he became himself restless, agitated and disturbed. His appetite failed, and he lost in a great measure the power of sleeping, even when he had an opportunity of taking repose. At length reason gave way. It was necessary to confine him to his home; and though watched over with the tenderest solicitude by the loving ones by whom he was surrounded, he died within a very few weeks, a raving maniac.

Another case was that of a strong and active man engaged in a manufacturing business, which he prosecuted with great energy, to the advantage of his family and also of the persons in his em-

* Continued from p. 78.

ployment, to whom he was liberal and by whom he was beloved. He had been always of a cheerful temper, and at the same time of a religious turn; just one of those who might have been supposed least to require a revival action, and least likely to yield to its influence. But when the revival made its appearance in the neighbourhood of his residence, he was drawn to visit some of the prayer-meetings which were held for the purpose of spreading it. At some of these, cases of prostration took place in his presence, and statements of their experience were made by persons who had been previously struck. By these his mind was deeply impressed, though he was not himself affected with any of the usual bodily symptoms. He frequently spoke of the "convictions" which had occurred as the undoubted work of God's Holy Spirit; and in the apparent desire and hope of being similarly affected himself, he began to give up much of his time to such gatherings. He frequented all that were within his reach. By degrees he became melancholy and abstracted, unwilling and unfit to attend to his business, and at length unmistakeably insane. He was placed in an asylum, where at first good hopes were entertained of his recovery; but they were fallacious hopes. In a short time the loss of reason was followed by the extinction of life.

The third case which we shall mention was that of a female, a wife and mother, described by the witnesses on the inquest which was held to examine the cause of her death, as a most deserving person, remarkably intelligent, and tenderly beloved by her husband and children. She went on one occasion to a meeting-house (not that which she usually attended) for the purpose of hearing the Rev. S. J. Moore, of Ballymena, a celebrated revival preacher. His text was, "Quench not the Spirit;" and he endeavoured to impress on his auditory the awful responsibility under which they lay if they opposed or resisted the revival. At the moment of a solemn appeal to the consciences of his hearers, loud, piercing screams were heard throughout the house, and three persons were carried out in what are called "convictions." On that day she received a shock from which she never recovered. She became moody and depressed; declared that there was for her no hope of salvation; begged that she might be sacrificed; and when her son refused to perform that request, said she would do it herself. She never rallied from this wretched state, and in two months she was a corpse. The coroner, who is a zealous patron of the revival, hearing that her death was commonly charged on that movement, caused her remains to be exhumed, and summoned a jury, with a view to see whether it might not rather be attributed to the treatment she had experienced during her illness. Not the slightest ground was discovered for such an imputation. She had got no medicine but a little castor oil and a few doses of laudanum, six drops at a time, with occasionally

a little ether. The jury instantly returned a verdict of "Death from natural causes."

We need not dwell upon such cases farther; but the undeniable fact that there were such cases, cases in which congregations have been deprived of their pastors, families bereaved of their parents, and neighbourhoods robbed of some of their most useful members, such losses being directly traceable to the revival movement, ought, we think, to make the most ardent spiritualist pause before voluntarily introducing into the community to which he belongs an instrumentality fraught with so much mischief. Who would wish to make himself answerable for the death of even a single fellow-creature, prematurely hurried into eternity? Has any man a right to follow up his spiritual fancies at the risk of destroying life?

It may be urged that the cases in which life was destroyed were few comparatively. It is true they were few in comparison with the vast number of persons who were seized with the mental and bodily maladies which were dignified with the name of revival; yet not so few as to be utterly unworthy of notice. The writer of these remarks has heard of not less than a dozen, although he has made no inquiry nor taken any pains to discover them. It is probable that if such examples were carefully sought out, they would amount to five or six times that number. Even that amount, however, is but small when compared with the multitudes in whom the malady did not go the length of destroying life. Of these, however, a great many have been left in a condition compared with which the destruction of life would have been a less serious evil. It will at once be perceived that we now allude to the multiplied cases of insanity which have been occasioned by the revival movement.

In the three instances above described, in which death was the result, and in every other fatal case of which we have heard, death was preceded by the loss of reason. But many were the instances in which insanity was brought on, distinctly and undeniably, through the impression made on the mind and body by the addresses delivered at revival meetings and the scenes which were there witnessed. One was casually brought under our notice a few days ago. It is that of a young woman of exemplary character, whose industry was almost the sole support of herself and a widowed mother in feeble health: her brother, the only other member of the family, having enlisted as a soldier, is now in a distant land. She went to a prayer-meeting in the course of last summer, while the excitement was at its height. Several young persons were "struck" during the evening. Some time afterwards she thought of going again to a similar gathering; she was dissuaded, lest she should "take it" and be rendered incapable of attending to her work; she went, however, thinking there was no danger. But she was mistaken. She

was brought home in violent convulsions. After a series of recoveries and relapses, she became first frantic, then melancholy, and is now in the lunatic asylum. Her mother has been removed to the workhouse, of which she will probably be an inmate for life. The tendency of revivalism to generate insanity is not denied now by its warmest advocates. Even at an early period in the history of the movement, it was seen and acknowledged. The Rev. D. Adams, who claims to be considered the father of the revival, admits that, when he published his pamphlet, one such case had occurred in his congregation. "Thank God," he says, "none of our awakened have gone astray in their mind, except *one*, like a single house blown down by the purifying hurricane. She is a most respectable married woman, always devoutly inclined, about forty years of age, and the mother of seven children. She was very weak from a lingering consumption, and her case, perhaps, was not well managed when she received the divine impulse. Under these circumstances, unfortunately, reason was dethroned, and the mind wanders." (*Revival at Ahoghill*, p. 15.) There is no more ardent champion of the cause than Mr. Moore, one of the Presbyterian ministers of Ballymena, the gentleman whose sermon on "Quench not the Spirit" was the means of extinguishing first the reason and afterwards the life of an amiable and exemplary woman. In his *History and Prominent Characteristics of the Revival in Ballymena*, published in July, when the excitement was rampant, he says, "The minds of some *three poor creatures* have given way; whether from predisposition, or fright, or the long continued apprehension of hell, without any feeling or hope of deliverance, or whether from injudicious treatment, or cruel restraint from the society and sympathy of kindred spirits, or from want of food and sleep, or from several of these causes combining, I am unable to determine" (p. 13). Dr. Salmon, in the Appendix to his valuable sermon on the "Evidences of the Work of the Holy Spirit," quotes a letter published by Mr. Craig, of the neighbourhood of Ahoghill, a gentleman who sympathizes strongly with the revival movement, but yet says, "There is one side of the picture which I almost am afraid to turn to you, but I feel that I should not be doing my duty were I to keep it back. There are *three or four persons* in this locality who have not got better from their conviction, but are raving maniacs as yet. I cannot look upon them without shuddering. They seem to answer the description of those spoken in the New Testament as possessed of devils. This is, as I think, God's mysterious work; but I cannot fathom it." (*Salmon*, p. 31.) The Rev. Isaac Nelson, a Presbyterian minister in Belfast, states among the results of the revival, that "in most cases of prostration a state of health was produced most *dangerous* to the individual; .... in many cases, sad deplorable

madness was the consequence." (*Person and Work of the Holy Spirit*, p. 16.) Another writer whom we have already quoted, and always with that respect which we sincerely feel for his piety and manly truthfulness on this as on all other questions, enumerates among the fruits and accompaniments of the so-called revival agitation, "fanaticism of the wildest type, the derogation and dishonour of the sacred ministry, fraud, lying, and many other evils of a moral nature; while of physical evils are noticeable, disease of the worst kind generated and promoted,—hysteria, epilepsy, catalepsy, and *insanity in its most aggravated form*. This last evil has been denied as the consequence of the present agitation. I now assert that numerous cases of it have come under my own observation; and I have received still more numerous accounts of others, in this and the adjoining counties, on the most reliable authority. Some of the cases at present under treatment in our own district asylum, would harrow the heart of any person capable of a human impulse, and might well harrow the conscience of those who have been accessories to their occurrence. I have myself witnessed the young mother of a young family, one of the finest physical specimens of womanhood I have ever seen, reduced to the most distressing condition of raving insanity. One brother minister writes me word of a parishioner being sent naked through the country, under the same influence. Another, of a female reduced to the condition of a drivelling idiot; while in the three or four adjoining parishes are, at this moment, candidates for admission into the lunatic asylum. Another poor girl was struck; seized on by some bigoted sectarians, who first proselytized and then baptized her in an open river. She is likewise at this moment a lunatic." (*M'Ilwaine*, pp. 15, 16.) The same writer in a more recent publication says, "One more immediate result from the progress of revivalism in this province must, in justice to the subject, be specified. Insanity in one of its worst forms, *theomania*, and not unfrequently in others, perhaps equally to be dreaded, such as *acute mania*, has been developed to a fearful extent. Speaking guardedly, I may assert that, from unquestionable sources, I have come to the knowledge of at least *fifty such cases* within the last six months in this immediate neighbourhood. In three of our asylums, not to mention the numerous cases which could not and cannot be admitted owing to the over-crowded condition of the asylums, no fewer than thirty-three patients (five male and twenty-eight female) have been received during the space of time above mentioned, whose derangement is clearly referable to this cause." (See *Journal of Mental Science* for Jan. 1860, pp. 197, 198.) We cannot but add that statistics confirm these statements. The lunatic asylum at Londonderry for the insane poor of the counties of Londonderry and Donegall is at this moment filled to repletion, and many applications refused for

want of room. That at Armagh is so full that it has been necessary to convert a portion of the county jail into a place for the reception of lunatics; and at the last assizes the foreman of the grand jury stated to the Judge in open court, that this was occasioned by the great increase in the number of the insane poor caused by the then existing revival agitation. In the Belfast asylum, which is maintained by the counties of Down and Antrim, the case is very remarkable. Within the last year the building has been enlarged so as to accommodate 130 additional inmates. Every cell is now occupied, and more inmates are now lodged within its walls than the place was calculated to accommodate. Not only so, but, as in Armagh, a portion of the jail has been converted into a temporary asylum for lunatics. Nor is this all. It has been necessary to admit several such persons into the workhouses of the Belfast and many other Poor-law unions in both counties,—buildings which were erected for a totally different class of inmates, and in which the insane can neither be subjected to the treatment which is proper for their peculiar form of disease, nor to the restraints which are necessary for their own safety. Nay, the wards of the Belfast general hospital, though totally unfit for such a purpose, have to be employed at times as receptacles for the insane. It is not too much to affirm that during and immediately after the period of the revival agitation, the cases of insanity occurring in the district to which it extended were at least doubled. And all who are concerned in tracing the causes of this increase,—governors of the lunatic asylums, grand jurors, Poor-law guardians, and hospital directors,—concur in attributing it to the prevalence of the revival mania. The cases to which these statistics apply are exclusively those of the poor. But the occurrence of insanity was not confined to revivalists in the lower ranks. It has already been stated that comparatively few persons who moved in the upper walks of society were "stricken" or "convicted." A few were; and it is a circumstance worth noticing, that, in every such case which has come to our ears, the result was either death or insanity. A minister who took an active part in the movement was deprived of the use of reason for a time. He was sent to a private asylum, where, under judicious treatment, and in the absence of the exciting scenes which had acted so powerfully on his mind, he speedily recovered, and is now, we are happy to know, restored to his family and has returned to the duties of the pastorship; but the occurrence of such cases should be a warning to all, even those who look upon their own minds as of the strongest build, how they play with edged tools. If they throw themselves into such a movement, and are successful in exciting a large amount of fanaticism among their poor and ignorant fellow-christians, they may find that the morbid effects of the agitation are not always confined to that class of the com-

munity, but may occasionally re-act upon their own nearest and dearest, or even upon themselves.

But the loss of reason was by no means the worst feature in the psychical phenomena consequent on the so-called revival. Intellect is a lofty gift, and its ruin is deeply to be deplored; but a pure and holy heart is better; and the ruin of a conscience hitherto void of offence is the most melancholy spectacle that can be presented to the moral inquirer. Most unfortunately, the boasted awakening of Ulster in 1859 has been fruitful in such examples.

. That the patrons and propagators of the agitation had recourse to the most unjustifiable means of spreading its influence, is broadly asserted by one who knows well the persons and the facts of which he speaks. "The revival had its literature, periodical and stated. Under the former head may be classed some local journals, in which was regularly seen the daily column headed *Religious Revival in Belfast.* These 'daily readings' served as most effectual fuel to the revival excitement; though indeed they might of themselves have gone far with any well-judging and reflecting person to reveal the true character of the human element at work in that remarkable movement. Suffice it to say that such journalism was characterized by *the most unprincipled exaggeration and unscrupulous misstatement.* These, of course, were in a great measure concealed and unknown to readers at a distance; but to those on the spot who were cognizant of the real facts of the case, the *spirit of lying* which prevailed became disgusting in the extreme. Nor was this the only sample of laxity in morals which the revival organs presented. 'Anger, wrath, malice,' vituperation, misrepresentation and 'all uncharitableness,' were the weapons of their warfare, wielded with all the energy imaginable in the case, against any who differed from revivalism. Some of the instruments, too, employed in the production of this species of literature were curiously characteristic; for example, detailed histories of the movement have appeared from the pens of individuals whose habits *notoriously oscillated between drunkenness and sobriety.* 'Penny-a-liners' and sub-editors of professedly religious and respectable papers executed their daily and weekly tasks in the same spirit and with the same results as regards veracity." *(Journal of Mental Science* for Jan. 1860, pp. 179, 180.) The quantity of fiction which was broached in reference to the movement during the last summer and autumn was indeed enormous. There was no assertion, however astounding, which the public credulity would not swallow; and there were agents at work who were quite willing to pander to its depraved appetite. We have already alluded to the scandalous falsehoods *propagated*—we hope and believe *not invented*—by the Rev. Mr. Marrable, in reference to a respectable family near Ballymena,—falsehoods which, though promptly and cir-

cumstantially contradicted by every person acquainted with the facts, have never yet been retracted. (See *Chris. Ref.* for Jan., p. 29.) This was but a sample of the gross impositions by which the public at a distance were systematically deluded. Some of the "converts" speedily became aware of the ease with which the credulity of the religious world could be practised upon, and were not slow to avail themselves of it for their own advantage.

We have spoken of the tendency of such a mental and bodily condition as was developed in the "stricken" to generate visions; and of the curious fact that in all the visions which were described, the visionary herself was universally the heroine of the scene. The whole interest of the piece was concentrated, whatever may have been its incidents, in the person to whose mind it was presented. In short, *self* was manifestly the prevailing idea, and all the mental impressions grouped themselves insensibly in such a manner as to give prominence and importance to that one object. The same feeling predominated in not a few of the "cases" when the powers of volition were no longer suspended; and when it became evident that, owing to the number of persons who were favoured with visions, the mere fact of seeing them was no longer to be of itself a means of exciting interest and attracting attention, other means were resorted to, at first of the nature of petty arts rather than gross frauds, but afterwards rising to the dignity of the most blasphemous imposture.

First we heard of sleeping cases. People who had been "smitten down," but had partially recovered, though not so far as to be able to resume their work, sometimes fell over into a dozy and dreamy half-conscious state, or into perfect and tranquil sleep, which, though it may have been but the natural result of the physical paroxysm through which they had passed, was universally regarded as produced, like the paroxysm itself, by the miraculous agency of the Divine Spirit. They became objects of much interest to all concerned in the movement. Often, on opening their eyes from slumber, they would find their humble habitation crowded with ministers, scripture-readers, class-leaders, ladies and others, who had been gathered together to witness their appearance while asleep and when awaking, and to hear the narrative of the visions with which it was assumed they would probably be favoured. We have been informed that in most cases the gratification of the "converts" on witnessing this proof of the interest felt in them was unmistakeable, and was very naïvely expressed. With some it became a manifest object to keep up this pleasing interest. The first method resorted to was that of simply announcing beforehand the day and hour at which the preternatural somnolency would recur; and the event was sure to answer to the prediction. Sometimes the prophecy assumed a simpler form. The patients would announce that it had been revealed to them that at a given hour they would be *deprived*

of the power of speech, and that the impediment would be removed after a specified duration. "A young girl in a congregation in this town, as related by the correspondent of a London journal, announced to those around her that she would be deaf and dumb *for twenty minutes!* Accordingly she was removed to the vestry, and at the expiration of the twenty minutes she was restored to speech and hearing. She then gravely informed the Christians round her that this wonder had happened to her on account of *no want of faith in herself;* it was sent only on account of the unbelief of some around her. 'Yes, my dear,' said a person present, 'I have been unbelieving up to this time, but now I believe.'" (*Nelson*, p. 15.) Blindness was in like manner brought on at times, and even deafness; and these were sometimes predicted by the persons who were the subjects of them. The hour of awaking from the revival slumber was also in many cases foretold by the sleeper, as well as that of falling into it. In some instances, no doubt, the whole of this was fictitious, the sleep and all its circumstances being simply counterfeited; in others, we believe the sleep was real, but voluntarily brought on, and the hour of awakening accurately kept by a power like that which some persons not morbidly affected possess, of bringing on and shaking off sleep at any predetermined time. Physicians affirm that such facts are quite analogous to morbid phenomena with which their practice makes them familiar. But in addition to the predicted arrival and departure of sleep, some of the patients professed to be able to select portions of scripture and appropriate hymns while lying sound entranced, with their eyes closely shut, and in some cases even to be able to find in the Bible passages which were recited by bystanders or indicated by means of reference to chapter and verse! Yet this was what some of them professed to be able to do, and their power to do so was religiously believed by the religious public. The writer of this paper must here take the liberty of introducing a small specimen of his own experience. During the course of the last autumn he was waited upon by a lady whom he did not then know even by name, but whom he finds frequently mentioned in the revival publications as a most zealous and successful agent in carrying forward the revival work. Her errand with him, however, was one of pure benevolence; and in reference to the case which she had then in view, she had certainly acted with remarkable good-nature and no less soundness of judgment. After her wishes in reference to this case had been attended to, she introduced the subject of the revival, and, among the rest, the phenomena of the "sleeping cases." He expressed his doubts. For these she said she was fully prepared; but added, "that no one who had seen, as she had, a person, residing within a few minutes' walk of the place where she was then standing, who could find any portion of God's word that might be indicated by

a bystander, while sound asleep and incapable of seeing, would at once perceive that God's Spirit and his hand were in the work." He replied that undoubtedly if such were the facts, they must be miraculous; that though not inclined to place much reliance on modern miracles, he was fully prepared to believe what he saw himself, and begged to be taken to see this remarkable case. The lady promised to bring him on the next recurrence of the state of trance. *But she has never done so.* Perhaps she has found reason to suspect imposture in what she evidently believed at first as undoubtingly as she believed the truth of the gospel. The fact is certain, that shortly after this interview, persons who had formerly patronized the "sleeping cases" as the most decisive evidence of the presence of God's Holy Spirit, began to rest their case on other arguments; to say that, without relying upon them, there were enough of proofs to satisfy themselves; and at length in some instances, and with evident reluctance, to admit that imposture was at work, and that it was needful to remember the apostolical injunction "not to trust every spirit, but to try the spirits whether they be of God." We believe there is not an educated man or woman in the north of Ireland this day—always excepting those whose own reputation is bound up with that of the revival and all its adjuncts—who does not acknowledge that these miraculous sleeping cases were from first to last a transparent fallacy, to which many good people were, from their religious feelings, too easily induced to lend their faith.

But the suspicion of imposture did not at first arise in connection with the "sleeping cases," though they were, one would think, sufficiently easy to see through. We had accounts of the *stigmata;* marks impressed, and letters, or characters supposed to be letters, inscribed on the breast, the hands, the arms, and various parts of the body, by the immediate action of God's Holy Spirit! Many such cases occurred in Belfast; some in the neighbouring town of Lisburn, and several others in various parts of the country. One case of the kind occurred in a girl inhabiting a wretched hovel in one of the most miserable lanes in Belfast. A friend of the writer called to see her. She was in bed, half dressed, surrounded by a levee of persons of both sexes. She had been frequently "stricken down" at prayer-meetings and on other occasions, and had had many visions. A kinswoman, who acted as mistress of the ceremonies, explained that the form of a cross had made itself visible upon her breast while she lay in a trance, and that it was still partially perceptible; but that it was at some times far more distinct than at others. It was now "gone in;" however, the visitors were at liberty to inspect the place. Our friend accordingly examined it; and on looking at it narrowly, there were discernible on the upper part of the breast-bone the traces of a rudely-shaped cross, apparently scratched on the surface with the point of a needle

or pin. No colouring matter seemed to have been employed. Every visitor who inspected the girl's breast deposited an offering. In a short space during which our friend remained in the place, *upwards of eleven shillings* were collected,—probably twice as much as the wretched girl had ever earned in any one week by honest industry. We should have mentioned that similar liberality was generally displayed in favour of the wonder-working "sleeping cases." It is probable that this girl during the fortnight that the imposture lasted realized from twenty to thirty pounds sterling.

When the public were willing to pay so liberally for being hoaxed, no one will be surprised that plenty of individuals were found who were willing "to fool them to the top of their bent." Soon another case was announced, still more marvellous. The first had simply had a cross impressed upon her bosom; in the next case, (a young man,) the cross was improved into a picture, in outline, of the Saviour on the cross. This case also was greatly run after, and was a profitable speculation. A whole harvest of cases occurred in a few days. Girls were exhibited at so much a head, on whose bosoms, arms or hands, the Holy Spirit had caused the blessed Saviour's name to appear in written characters; usually misspelled, however; "JEASUS" and "JHESUS" being the most common readings. On some, "MY CRIST" was to be seen. (We adhere to the miraculous orthography.) Some were warned by the misgivings which these deviations from the current mode of spelling occasioned, and contented themselves with exhibiting a series of marks and characters, which the pious affirmed to contain most marvellous revelations, though unfortunately conveyed in an alphabet which nobody was able to read, and a language which nobody could understand. We are tempted to give here, though it will occupy some space, an account of what he witnessed in a visit to one such case, given by Mr. M'Cann, of Lisburn, a devout believer in all the wonders of the revival movement. He was called upon, being himself, as he says, "under conviction," to go and see a young woman named Mary Hare, at a place named Red Hill, at the late hour of eleven o'clock at night. He went and found her in bed. Having heard that she had "marks" upon her person, he spoke to her about them; when she held up both her arms, which were covered with red letters of various sizes. "I examined the letters minutely for a considerable time, but could not make out any particular words from them. I then asked the girl if she had any other marks upon her, when she said she had, and at once shewed to all present the upper portion of her breast, upon which were observed, in a circular form, many other letters precisely similar in appearance, together with the shape of a lamb in the centre; and farther down on the centre of the breast

was the appearance of a cross with a man upon it, and either the figure of a crown, or, as I best recollect, the letter 'B' upon the forehead. I again examined all the marks most particularly, but without being at all able to make any sense or language out of them; when a gentleman having asked me what I thought about them, I replied that I thought they were Hebrew characters, and such as no one there could understand. I then said to the young woman, 'Have you got any knowledge of the marks which have been seen upon your body? Do you know anything of the language or meaning thereof?' She replied, 'No, Sir, I do not;' the reason being, because they were not then *finished*. I hesitated for a moment, and then said, 'Well, I believe you will get some knowledge of them before we leave the house;' to which I got no reply..... About ten or fifteen minutes after, Mary Hare said to me, 'I know it now, Sir;' and in a loud voice, spoke thus: 'I AM CHRIST; BELIEVE MY WRITINGS! I AM KING OF HEAVEN AND OVER ALL! AND I SAY UNTO ALL, *Believe!*'".... "The following Sunday, which was the 11th of September,... about the hour of eleven o'clock at night, I was sent for by the desire of this young woman, and on arriving with many others who accompanied me, we found assembled upwards of one hundred people.... The arms, breast and forehead of Mary Hare were all covered over with numerous letters, and the figures of a star, crown, &c. &c.; and after waiting in silent expectation for half an hour, Mary Hare.... in a loud voice gave us the language or meaning of the marks, which had just at that time been *finished* upon her body, in the following words, viz.

"'I AM CHRIST THE GLORIOUS LORD! I AM KING OF GLORY! THIS IS MY HAND-WRITING; I HAVE WRITTEN IT ON YOU AND OTHERS; AND I SAY UNTO ALL, *Believe!*

"'SHE IS MINE AND I AM HIS (sic.); AND I SAY UNTO ALL, *Believe!*

"'I HAVE BROUGHT YOU HERE THIS DAY TO CONVINCE SOME SINNERS; AND I SAY UNTO ALL, *Believe!*

"'BELIEVE MY GLORIOUS WRITINGS, FOR I AM THE LORD GOD ALMIGHTY! I SUPPOSE IF I WOULD (sic.) COME DOWN IN MY FULL GLORY, THEY WOULD NOT BE CONVINCED.'" (*M'Cann on the Revival Movement in Lisburn*, pp. 43—45.)

We have given this narrative in the words of a devout believer in the genuineness of all that he records; a few only being omitted to avoid the prolixity of the writer; but nothing is left out that could change the character of the story. It is difficult to understand how any sane person could be imposed upon by such a clumsy contrivance, or any religious person deluded by such audacious blasphemy. But the fact was even so. Mary Hare was visited by thousands of persons of well-known piety

and respectable position in society; by the greater part, if not the whole, of whom her explanation of the marks was received as an immediate message from the Almighty!

But we must do the Rev. W. Breakey, the Presbyterian minister of Lisburn, the justice to say that he gave no credence to these "lying wonders." In an address to his people on the subject of them, he says, "I visited and keenly scrutinized five such cases. These parties were visited by *thousands*. It was boasted to me by the friends of one of them, that no less than 2000 had gone to see her. I am myself aware that great numbers flocked from all directions and from great distances, some on jaunting cars, some on foot, to see the miraculous images stamped on their arms and bosoms. . . . . One woman persisted to my very face that while the Saviour's name was stamped upon her breast, something like a photographic image of him was at that moment stamped on the palms of her hands. I examined her hands, and found an utter blank. She said *she* saw it, but that *I* could not, because I had not been stricken down! *Last week, it was at great risk that I dared to question these wonders.*" (*King*, p. 43.) Mr. Breakey then describes the four other cases. In the first, he saw nothing extraordinary. With reference to the second, there were no marks visible while he was present. On the body of the third there were some zigzag strokes which he was told signified, "My Christ;" but he could make nothing out of them, even with the help of the interpretation. The fourth case he visited in company with a brother minister, the Rev. Mr. Hall: they saw certain marks upon her, which they both at once suspected had been put on with a blue-bag. Mr. Hall says, "I called for a damp cloth, which, after some persuasion, the people allowed to be applied to the arm, on which a woman present said *she had seen the word* 'Lord' *grow!* With the cloth Mr. Breakey rubbed out two of the letters with the greatest ease. He then called the attention of the people, and, holding the arm up before all present, rubbed the other two off without the least difficulty. I never saw a more clumsy or futile attempt at imposture; and regret much to learn that any one can be so wicked as to persevere in the deceit, or can find people so weakly credulous as to heed such nonsense." (*King*, p. 44.) Mr. Breakey gives the statement of a gentleman who, after this occurrence, witnessed a mark on the breast of one of these people. "As I stood by the girl's bed-side, listening attentively, I heard her sing snatches of hymns and speaking occasionally short sentences. At last, throwing out her arms, she exclaimed, 'O God, convert the strangers who visited Mary Saunders' (the heroine of the blue-bag). '*Don't let Breakey come near me!* Oh! God strike them down dead!—and then, oh! then there is nothing for them but hell and damnation!'" (*King*, p. 45.) Our readers may imagine the extent of the gullibility which

prevailed among the favourers of the revival movement, when communications like the preceding were received as the immediate promptings of the Holy Spirit of God! In fact, there was nothing too absurd or blasphemous to find thousands of ready dupes, if it only came in the shape of a divine manifestation in favour of the revival. Not only inward, but outward, miracles were freely asserted and implicitly believed. "Mr. Peter Drummond, of Stirling, well known in the religious world, declared to a public meeting in Glasgow, that individuals in and about Ballymena had manifested the most miraculous evidence of God's presence among them, such as falling from a considerable height to the ground without being hurt. And as to their seeing heaven and hell, God and Satan, it was quite in harmony with what he would expect!" (*Nelson*, p. 15.) Thousands were under the same delusion with "Mr. Peter Drummond, of Stirling, well known in the religious world." At one time a congregation in a Presbyterian meeting-house beheld the Holy Spirit visibly hovering over them in a bodily form! A non-revival bystander could only see a butterfly flitting across the ceiling; but that was in consequence of his unbelief. In the *Belfast Newsletter*, a revival organ, under date of Nov. 24, 1859, is a letter attested by the signatures of two Presbyterian ministers, and written from Drum, in the county Monaghan, from which we quote the following:—"At one of our meetings for prayer, at which there were a number of convictions, a dark cloud formed in the ceiling, and in the course of a few minutes a number of forms bursted out. One in particular was of human appearance, which passed and re-passed across all the lights, and descended to the pew in which a young woman was rejoicing. The appearance, which lasted three minutes or more, produced no terror, but joy, especially among all the converts. Perhaps 300 saw it and could testify to the reality. I cannot tell what it was; the substance is in heaven, and will not be visible till every eye shall see Him." We had marked about a dozen extracts more for transcription, but we have given enough and more than enough to shew that the leading characteristics of the movement, first and last, were fanaticism, folly and fraud.

But it may be asked, has not great good resulted from all this? Has not a great moral reformation been effected in the province of Ulster? Has not crime diminished? Have not many female outcasts given up their abandoned mode of life? Have not very many of the retailers of ardent spirits withdrawn from their trade as sinful, or no longer profitable, owing to the changed habits of the people? If these things were so, we should rejoice and bless God who is able out of the evil to bring forth good; though we should not feel ourselves at liberty to do or help forward the evil that the good might come out of it. But every one of the above questions must be answered, if truly

answered, in the negative. We take Belfast and Ballymena as samples, these having been the head quarters of the revival, and the places in which, if anywhere, its salutary effects should be most perceptible. In both these towns there has been an *increase* in the number of public-houses since the revival began; in neither place was a single house of the kind closed for the assigned reason. In neither has been any diminution in the quantity of spirits sold to the keepers of such houses. In neither place has there been any decrease in the number of those unfortunate women who have been alluded to; though several of them took the epidemic, and were objects of much interest to the religious public. "Several of these poor creatures, I believe nine, took temporary refuge in the union workhouse of Belfast; but in a very few days they returned, every one of them, to their abandoned habits." (*Rev. W. M'Ilwaine*, ap. *Journal of Mental Science*, p. 197.) The police of Belfast are unaware of any diminution in this wretched class of the population. As to the disappearance of crime generally, so far is it from being a fact, that the very reverse is the truth. We have before us the return of cases disposed of at the Belfast sessions for the first ten months of the years 1858 and 1859. It will be remembered that the work of revival began in May of the last-mentioned year. During the months of January, February, March and April, 1858, the number of cases was 2890; in the corresponding months of 1859, (before the revival began,) the number was 2801; shewing a trifling decrease. Now mark the contrast. In the succeeding six months of 1858, the number was 5113; in the corresponding period of 1859, (which was a period of strong revival action,) the number was 5824; shewing an increase of 711 cases. We may add that there was an increase in each of the six months, but greatest in the month of July, when the revival was at its height. The returns for Ballymena shew the very same result. Both in Belfast and in Ballymena, some of the "stricken" have been sentenced to punishments, more or less severe, for acts of fraud. It is plain, therefore, that fanaticism and excitement are not the cures for the evils of society. So far as they produce any effect, they aggravate them. We not only admit, but rejoice in believing, that some of the "stricken" have not returned to vices in which they had formerly indulged. May their amendment be permanent, is our hearty prayer. But we must await the issue, and that can only be known by time. We cannot work ourselves up to the high pitch of confidence possessed by the Rev. B. W. Noel, who after a hasty visit to Ireland, in which he saw "something of this great work," is able to bear his testimony that "God has drawn some thousands to Jesus, who are now manifesting by *all* the fruits of the spirit the reality of their conversion. Converts in every part of Ulster love God for his unspeakable gift, love the Saviour for redeeming and saving them, love each other, ...

dread sin and do their duty." (*Preface to Weir on Irish Revivals*, p. 2.) We can only say that if fraud, imposture and blasphemy be sins, *some* of the converts do not dread it; and if to labour for their own living by honest industry, instead of relying on the contributions of the religious public, be a duty, some of them would rather not do it. Whether, however, the estimate of the general character of the movement formed by this rapidly-travelling and rather enthusiastic divine, or that formed by Dr. Hincks, Mr. M'Ilwaine, Mr. Nelson and the writer of these pages, who live in the midst of it, be the more correct, time will shew. Our hopes are not sanguine.

One thing must be stated. The revival is over. Its very name is a laughing-stock in circles where a few months ago it was pronounced with religious awe and dread. We are aware of cases in which young persons who had been affected with all the usual symptoms, and some of whom had been called on by their ministers to state their experience in public, now laugh at their own folly in allowing themselves to be persuaded that the sensations which they experienced had any connection with religion. The principal movers in the revival are derided as blind guides; and every one who took part in promoting it has suffered in public estimation. No doubt an effort will be made next summer to galvanize it into the spasmodic semblance of life. But its vitality is extinct; many who too simply lent to it their countenance are now heartily ashamed of it and of themselves; and none henceforth will afford it any support but those of the very lowest grade in intellectual and moral culture. It is with the days of other years.

Belfast, Feb. 1860. J. S. P.

LINES SUGGESTED BY A SERMON ON THE DEATH OF AN AGED LADY, FROM JOB v. 26.

If when the corn in full and ample ear,
Standing in shock, rewards the sower's care,—
If when the season ripens well the grain,
And glorious plenty crowns both hill and plain,—
If when the reaper gathers in the store,
And the rich sheaves bestrew the garner floor,
We bless our God for his good gifts to man,
And humbly praise Him for his gracious plan
In thus providing for our earthly wealth,
Our comfort, happiness and present health,—
How far exceeding should our praises be
For his provision for eternity,
When to the grave his faithful servants come,
And in full age find there a peaceful home.

THE LATE REV. BENJAMIN CARPENTER, OF NOTTINGHAM.

THIS excellent man, whose death at Leamington, on the 21st of January, after a painful illness of twelve months' duration, we briefly noticed in a former number, was born in October, 1796, at Luffenham, near Uppingham, in Rutlandshire, where his father farmed a small property of his own. The family of the Carpenters was very respectable, and had been for many generations in possession of an estate at the Woodrow, in the neighbourhood of Bromsgrove, Worcestershire. In the churchyard at Bromsgrove there is a long row of tombstones belonging to the family. Mr. Carpenter was cousin by a double relationship to the late eminent Dr. Lant Carpenter, of Bristol. Their fathers were brothers, and married two sisters. Mr. Joseph Carpenter, the father of the subject of the present notice, died in 1803, leaving several daughters and an only son considerably younger than the youngest of his sisters. His property was much encumbered at the time of his decease, and, as he died intestate, Benjamin became his sole heir. The mother appears to have been an energetic person, who kept the property together and brought up her children respectably. On her son's attaining his majority, the estate was sold; and the proceeds, after clearing off all encumbrances, he divided equally, with characteristic generosity, between his sisters and himself. The family of the Carpenters belonged to the Presbyterian denomination; but on Mr. Joseph Carpenter's removing into Rutlandshire, he joined the Methodists, and some of his daughters married into that connection. It was at one time intended to bring up the son to his father's employment, and he was sent with that view to a cousin who had a farm near Cardiff; but as he shewed no aptitude for the work, the design was abandoned. After his father's death, he was adopted by his uncle, the late Rev. Benjamin Carpenter, of Stourbridge, after whom he had been named, and by whom he was educated and prepared in the first instance for the Christian ministry. His uncle was an Arian, and the nephew, though he afterwards modified in some respects his earliest views, retained strongly through life those modes of thinking and speaking on religious subjects which he had acquired under his pious and excellent guardian. His uncle's doctrinal predilections determined his place of academical education. At the suitable age he was sent to Wymondley, in Hertfordshire, where the foundation of Mr. Coward was then placed, previous to its removal to the metropolis at the opening of the University of London. In this institution he had for his fellow-students Mr. Malleson, of Brighton, Mr. Toller, of Kettering, and the late Mr. Whitehead, of Ainsworth, near Bolton, in Lancashire, between whom and himself, notwithstanding some diversities of theological sentiment, there subsisted

a warm and steadfast friendship till the close of life. His first settlement was as minister of the Arian congregation, since extinct, in Call Lane, Leeds. Dr., then Mr., Hutton had recently accepted the pastoral charge of the Mill-hill congregation in the same town, and between the two ministers a cordial friendship arose, accompanied by a free exchange of sentiment on religious subjects, which had the effect of inducing Mr. Carpenter to adopt some views more in accordance with the prevalent type of Unitarian belief. This led ultimately to further change and a new position in the church. On the death of the Rev. Henry Turner in 1822, Dr. Hutton strongly recommended his friend for the vacant office in his former flock at Nottingham, and the result was the election of Mr. Carpenter as co-pastor with the Rev. James Tayler of the High-Pavement congregation in that town. This union subsisted till the death of Mr. Tayler in 1831, and was maintained throughout with an unbroken harmony and a growing mutual regard. It was cemented by Mr. Carpenter's marrying, in 1825, the eldest daughter of his venerated colleague. From 1831 till his own retirement in consequence of illness in 1859—a long period of eight-and-thirty years—Mr. Carpenter continued sole minister of the High-Pavement congregation, and devoted to its service his undivided time and energies. On the death of his cousin, Dr. Lant Carpenter, there was a strong wish on the part of some influential persons in the Lewin's-Mead congregation at Bristol, that Mr. Carpenter should be brought forward as his successor; but owing to some difficulties as to the relation in which the two ministers of the congregation should be placed towards each other, the design never came to effect. In 1858, conscious of failing health and strength, and feeling the undivided duties of his office too heavy for him, he requested the help of a coadjutor, and with that view generously placed half his salary at the disposal of the congregation. In the course of that year, Mr. Wm. Blazeby, who had recently completed his course in Manchester New College, was associated with him as assistant minister. But he was not destined for any extended prolongation of active service. Early in 1859, while attending a committee of one of the public institutions of Nottingham, he was overtaken by a seizure, from which he never completely recovered, and which left him with enfeebled powers of body and mind till death removed him to a higher life.

Of a life so simple, quiet and unambitious, spent in the faithful discharge of humble and holy duties, and filled with earnest, unpretending endeavours to improve and elevate the condition of that portion of society into which it had been cast, there is little for biography to record. The best human lives are often those of which there is the least to be said. They were faithful, *kind* and good. In their noiseless passage through the world,

they sweetened and purified it with the Christian influences which went out from them, and left a blessing in the hearts and homes on which they silently fell. Mr. Carpenter made no great sensation in his day, either as a preacher or a writer; but he will be long remembered with reverent gratitude by numbers, especially of the poor and afflicted, in the neighbourhood where he so faithfully laboured, as the most exemplary of pastors, a most kind-hearted and sympathizing Christian friend. Mr. Carpenter published little. What he wrote was, like the man, distinguished by sober, earnest piety and sound practical sense, without any remarkable originality of thought or brilliancy of expression. Three sermons were all that he ever gave to the public, all marked by the qualities just described:—one preached at Nottingham, March 1, 1840, entitled, "Christianity, in its Essential Principles and Spirit, a Religion for all Mankind;" another delivered before the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, in May, 1845, "On the Duty and Importance of making the Word of God our Sole Rule and Guide," published at the request of the Committee; and a third which appeared in the "Unitarian Pulpit." His little Manuals of Devotion and Practical Religion met with great acceptance and had a wide circulation. His Collection of Family Prayers, with references at the head of each to appropriate Scripture Reading, which was the expansion and completion of a similar book commenced by his uncle of Stourbridge, passed through three editions with successive enlargements, and he was meditating a fourth, which was extensively called for, when the stroke of sickness disabled him for further usefulness. His "Catechism on the First Principles of Religion, on the Ten Commandments and on the Lord's Prayer, &c., for the use of Schools and Private Families," went through four editions. He also published a Selection of Psalms and Hymns, with a short Preface, for the use of the two societies of Protestant Dissenters assembling in the High-Pavement chapel, Nottingham, and in Stockwell-Gate chapel, Mansfield. Some years ago, he communicated a series of papers to the Christian Reformer, giving a full and particular account of the High-Pavement congregation from the time of its origin in the reign of Charles the Second. This is a very interesting piece of Nonconformist history. The two first ministers of the congregation, Whitlocke and Reynolds, were intimate friends, who always lived under the same roof, and had been ejected from the principal church in the town. Whitlocke was of the same family with the celebrated Bulstrode Whitlocke, one of the Commissioners of the Great Seal under Cromwell. The two friends had studied under latitudinarian influences at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, the former under Cudworth, the latter under Whichcote. It is not improbable, therefore, that a large-hearted and catholic spirit was at work from the first in the religious services of the High-

Pavement society, under the retention of some of the outward forms of Calvinism. At the time of his seizure, Mr. Carpenter was projecting the collection and revision of this series of papers as a separate publication. It would have had its value as a contribution not only to the local history of Nottingham and its vicinity, but to the general history of English Nonconformity.

'As a citizen, Mr. Carpenter was eminently public-spirited and liberal. In the various institutions of the town of Nottingham, and the many benevolent and enlightened efforts for which it has of late years been distinguished, to promote the health, the mental improvement and the innocent recreations of the humbler classes of its inhabitants, he ever took a prominent and active part. In the origination and management of many of them he was immediately concerned. Of the Artizans' Library, of which he was one of the founders, he was the President till the day of his death. On all occasions, his sobriety and good sense, his Christian consistency and utter freedom from all selfish and ambitious aims, rendered his presence and co-operation invaluable, and procured him the respect and confidence of men of all sects and parties. How highly he was appreciated was strikingly indicated by constant inquiries from all quarters through his long illness, and by the large concourse at his funeral. Interest and sympathy were not confined to his own congregation, but manifested as warmly by clergymen and members of the Establishment as by Dissenters of every denomination. As a preacher, he was serious, practical and devout, distinguished rather by plain good sense than by any gifts of oratory. In his theology he was an Unitarian in the broad sense, as respects the only proper Object of religious worship. His views of the person and office of Christ were never very distinctly expressed, and were not perhaps perfectly definite to his own mind. His language on these points had a certain affinity with that of the older Arian school in which he had been brought up. We might perhaps in general terms describe his theology as reverently and cautiously scriptural. He was not gifted with the critical spirit, and was constitutionally averse from boldness of religious speculation. The Bible was to him, as we once heard him say, a book *sui generis*, and he handled it accordingly. He was content to search out its meaning, and let his faith rest humbly on what he accepted as its authoritative determination. But he was a thoroughly consistent Protestant, carrying out to its legitimate consequences the great principle of the right of private judgment. The warmth of his friendship was never chilled, as the writer can testify from a long and happy experience, by the widest diversity of theological conclusions. Though he had neither the tastes nor the habits of a regular student, and his appropriate sphere was active usefulness, yet he was a diligent and systematic reader of the *best* works on theology, as well as on political and economical

questions. His strength lay in solid, useful information, rather than in strict scholarship. His judicious distribution of his time and his resolute practice of early rising, summer and winter, enabled him to accomplish a great deal of reading before most people began their day. In his politics he was a firm Whig, opposed to all radicalism. Both in his political and in his religious opinions there was a strong tinge of conservatism; and we have often thought he would have been in his place in a comprehensive Establishment, resting on a few broad and generous traditions, with no need and no opportunity for the speculative restlessness and innovation which seem the natural food of Dissent. Yet he was singularly useful where he was. Aided by some excellent and devoted members of his flock, his ministry was eminently blessed, and crowned by most visible tokens of success. All the institutions connected with his congregation were flourishing. Its schools, in conducting which the laity of all ranks took an active part, were models of their kind. His Sunday services, without any popular attractions, were well attended, and the galleries, so often a wilderness of empty pews, filled with devout and attentive worshipers of the humbler class. The secret of this success was the deeply religious spirit which animated his labours, and the untiring faithfulness with which all the duties of a pastor were discharged.

In the private relations of life, Mr. Carpenter's spirit and conduct were exemplary. Never was a human being more free from guile, selfishness or malignity. He was the most faithful and affectionate of husbands, brothers and friends. His very voice and look inspired you with the confidence that you were dealing with an honest and true-hearted man. His Christianity was a practical religion. His one aim was to do his duty as it lay straight before him, and leave the issue to God. In the last years of his life, before he began to feel the effects of the disease which brought him to the grave, his habits were remarkably active and healthy. He was alert early in the morning, and fond of vigorous bodily exercise; and his mind had that keen relish of innocent enjoyment and that elastic buoyancy of spirit which ever accompany the consciousness of pure affections and honest purposes. When you were with him, you were constantly reminded of the poet's description of human well-being, *mens sana in corpore sano.*

His old and attached friend, the Rev. Thomas Toller, of Kettering, thus writes of him:—"I cannot recall to mind any definite particulars relative to Mr. Carpenter's college days; but thus much I can say, that during five years of most unreserved intimacy with him, at that period of life when character is most transparent, his high moral principle, his amiable temper, his openness and generosity, commended equally my respect and my love; nor do I recollect in the whole course of that time any-

thing whatever in his conduct to lower the estimate I had formed of his worth."

A very near and affectionate female relative has added this testimony to his many excellences:—"I have been thinking over the early days of my cousin Benjamin, but I find from the circumstance of my being from home from 1805 to 1816, I had very little opportunity of personal intercourse. Now and then we met at the family residence, the Woodrow, and then he was a lively, amiable young man, fond of a little fun. Indeed, before he went to Leeds, my uncles doubted whether he would have sufficient gravity for his position." "Of late years our intercourse has been more frequent, both personally and by letter; and the more I knew him, the more I valued and loved him."

That useful and honourable life has now closed on earth; but it will not have passed away from us without a valuable lesson, if it shall remind us, as we look back on it with sorrowing regret, what were the qualities which made it so useful and brought it so much honour. We have had men amongst us far more brilliant, learned and eloquent,—more widely known to the world, and more likely to be remembered by future generations; but none ever left behind them a more unsullied name or a more cherished memory among those who had experience of their living goodness, none ever more consistently enforced by their practice the lessons which they taught from their lips. Our young men entering the ministry will do well to keep before them such an example as this, and see in it a guide to the holiest usefulness in the church. However the world may change, and demand new modes of action and utterance to meet its spiritual wants, the conditions of human respectability and influence continue unalterably the same. It is not cleverness, ready speech, controversial dexterity or ingenious speculation, that win the church's highest triumphs and achieve a solid, lasting victory over the sin and sorrow of the world,—but simple fidelity to conviction and steady, unwearied persistency in the path of duty. When we come to close our earthly account, it will be our best eulogy to be remembered by those whom we have helped and comforted on the journey of life, as the faithful and the good.

J. J. T.

EFFECTS OF THE FEAR OF FREE INQUIRY.

It is not the minds of heretics that are deteriorated most by the ban placed on all inquiry which does not end in the orthodox conclusions. The greatest harm done is to those who are not heretics, and whose whole mental development is cramped, and their reason cowed, by the fear of heresy.—*Mill on Liberty.*

A REJOINDER TO SOME ADDITIONAL STRICTURES ON AN ARTICLE IN THE NATIONAL REVIEW ON "EWALD'S APOSTOLIC AGE."

SIR,

THOUGH averse to prolong a controversy which places me in an antagonistic relation to some excellent men with whom I would gladly find myself in sympathy, yet I should be wanting in due literary courtesy, if I omitted all reply to the animadversions of your three correspondents, the Unitarian Minister, and my valued friends, Mr. Means and Mr. Bache; the more so as on some points they still, I think, misunderstand me, and on others, if they will allow me to say so, overlook the one point that is of any religious importance in the question at issue between us. The tone of some of the communications to your pages seems to assume, that I deny or throw into doubt the reality of Christ's resurrection, and rest my belief in immortality entirely on philosophical arguments.* On no other supposition can I see the pertinence of Mr. Bache's observations in your last number, p. 152 (5).

Of facts not susceptible of scientific demonstration, there is not one of which I entertain a firmer conviction than that of Christ's entrance into the invisible world, and of his having afforded to certain of his followers some irresistible evidence of his uninterrupted existence there, and of his occasional more immediate intercourse with them from that higher sphere. The arguments on which the greatest stress is laid by apologists in proof of the resurrection,—the conversion of Paul—the extraordinary change into trust and hope which soon followed the deep dejection and discouragement produced in believers at first by the crucifixion—the intense belief in a life after death, as a reality nearer and more vivid than the life on earth, so touchingly impressed on the manners and usages of that primitive age, and so different from anything in the contemporary heathenism†—the profound persuasion of the constant proximity of the risen and living Christ, which filled the mind of Paul, which the word ἐγκαλεῖσθαι, characteristic of the devotional phraseology of the early Christians, so expressively illustrates, and of which we have an indirect and casual and therefore a more conclusive, proof in

* I use the word *resurrection* (ἀνάστασις) in the sense which it had long borne among the Hellenistic Jews, to signify the transition from death to a higher life (ἀνάστασις εἰς ζωήν, 2 Maccab. vii. 14; comp. ibid. xii. 43—45; also LXX., Isaiah xxvi. 19). I ascribe to the word *ascension* (ἀνάληψις) a similar meaning, though I suppose it to be a word of later origin. The *idea* common to both terms which I wish distinctly to grasp and to keep steadily in view, is *the passage through death from the present to another life.*

† Many beautiful examples have been collected by Raoul-Rochette in his *Mémoires sur les Antiquités Chrétiennes*, strikingly in contrast with the absence of such feelings in the sepulchral monuments of the heathen, so learnedly illustrated by Mr. Kenrick in the elegant little volume referred to by Mr. Bache.

the "Christo, quasi deo, carmen dicere," of Pliny,—point with concentrated and exclusive force to the existence of phenomena, which I find nothing exactly corresponding to in the whole history of our race, and which are to me inexplicable apart from the admission of some *fact, out* of the course of ordinary human experience, which in that remarkable crisis of spiritual development, gave to a few minds selected by Providence to introduce it, a perceptible evidence of the risen Christ, and of the reality of the invisible state to which he had passed. I have expressed my opinion on this subject, and pointed out the contrast between Christian belief and heathen speculation, so decidedly in the article in the *National*, pp. 140, 141, that I am surprised any one should have doubted what my views really are, or have appealed to considerations in reply to me which have no intelligible bearing on them. I assert the same views again, pp. 148, 149, of the same article, and add, "This is only changing the mode of *super*natural influence, not denying the fact." As I have nowhere revoked or qualified this statement, and have never throughout the present controversy touched on the points in dispute between Unitarians and the orthodox, I am equally at a loss to understand what the Unitarian Minister means when he speaks of the "mixed orthodoxy and anti-supernaturalism of (my) article." (C. R., February, 1860, p. 81.) If the arguments which I have ever felt to be of most force in establishing the resurrection of Christ, should be thought to apply, as I think they do, more directly to a belief in the ascended Christ, and to the effects of that belief on the language and conduct of the disciples, than to the evidence of strictly corporeal manifestations before his ascension,—this is to me in a *religious* sense of no importance, or rather it brings out the only point which is to me of any importance; since what I need, as additional and special proof of the reality of a spiritual world to which the souls of the departed pass after death, is, as I have already several times remarked, the well-attested fact, not of re-appearance in an ordinary human body, capable of being touched and handled by ordinary human organs, on earth, but of the manifestation of a perpetuated individuality from the heavenly state. Such evidence, I think, we have; and I am grateful for it: and I am surprised that those who attach so much weight to the resurrection of Christ, as the only reliable basis for our hope of immortality, should not see that the view of it which I have advocated, is the only view which opens the invisible to us as a reality, by connecting a few mysterious human experiences with a state of being which lies ordinarily beyond our cognizance.

If I cannot accept the evidence for the *bodily* re-appearances as equally conclusive, it is not that I presumptuously cast them aside to make room for what my friend Mr. Means calls my hypothesis; for my order of thought has been exactly the re-

verse. I did not come down from the hypothesis to dissipate the alleged facts; but from a contemplation of the facts as they lay before me, I was forced for an intelligible interpretation of them to adopt the hypothesis. It was inability to comprehend and reconcile the records of those appearances, a consideration of the mode in which they had been transmitted to us, and a sense of the insuperable difficulties accompanying every attempt to realize them as *outward*, tangible facts,—which urged me, *not* to renounce my belief in the resurrection, but to concentrate my attention on that portion of the evidence respecting it, which seemed to me to carry the greatest weight, to place the event itself in the most satisfactory light, and to render it a direct confirmation of our hopes on the most solemn of all subjects. I am far from denying that my view has its difficulties, and leaves some points still unexplained. But difficulties press, as I think, with still greater weight on the opposite and popular view. It is a choice of difficulties. I have always represented it as such. In my article in the *National*, p. 145, I have said: "No one has a right to claim for either of these views the merit of exclusive rationality or credibility. Each is pressed with difficulties of its own, which may be stoutly denied, but do not therefore cease to exist. Each has some evidence in the narrative to allege for itself; and this conflicting evidence it is not so easy to reconcile." Again, in my "Reply to Strictures," &c., in your No. for January, p. 46, I have remarked, that "it will perhaps be found that the views which I have ventured to suggest, though not without their difficulties, involve on the whole the fewest." This is the position which I have all along taken, and which I wish to retain, in this controversy. I did not put forth my views as a complete solution of all the difficulties connected with this question, but as the explanation which to my own mind, and I had reason to believe to some other minds, was the most satisfactory and seemed best to harmonize the various aspects of the case. Under every view the subject presents very great difficulties. The Unitarian Minister is compelled to shroud his own view in "a mystery" which he considers it "mere folly and presumption to attempt to penetrate." (C. R., Oct., p. 588.) What he claims for himself, he should concede, I think, to others. It is not fair that this concession should be made to one side alone. I have read over carefully what my several opponents have written, and if I felt the force of their objections, no false pride should hinder me from acknowledging it; but on re-considering the whole controversy, I find no reason to retract or qualify in any material point the statements which I have made; my original views remain unaltered, on the whole perhaps strengthened.

If communications to the human mind from the invisible world are possible, those who assert their occurrence are exposed to the disadvantage of using language which must of necessity be

obscure, from its application to subjects which lie beyond the ordinary range of human experience, and to which no corresponding phraseology has precisely adapted itself. From this difficulty those who have to deal with facts falling directly under the cognizance of the senses, are free. Hence the former will be constantly charged with vagueness and obscurity, while the latter are commended for their perspicuity. The idea may, nevertheless, be just as distinctly apprehended in the one case as in the other. But the mass of men perpetually mistake familiarity with an established form of words for the apprehension of an idea; and any deviation from that form will be censured as obscure, though it may in truth exhibit the underlying truth more precisely. I have strongly felt my disadvantageous position in this respect, in arguing that the manifestations of the risen Christ were not those of his previous mortal body, against others who affirm that they were. It is concluded that there can be nothing intermediate between a material object acting on the outward sense, and mere inward thought or impression; and as this latter may be purely *subjective*, a transient state of mind, those who question the strictly *material* appearances of Christ after his resurrection, are supposed to take from the resurrection itself all objective certainty, and to reduce it to the possibility of mental delusion. I still think, however, that Mr. Jowett, in a passage already cited by me (*National Review*, No. XVII. p. 158), has very clearly marked the distinction between what he calls an *outward* and an *inward* fact. The very combination, *inward fact*, expresses the difference from an external impression through the senses on one hand, and from a mere subjective feeling on the other. *Fact*, used in this sense, is not mere thought or feeling.* It is something superinduced on the consciousness by an agency external to ourselves, which we recognize when it is presented to us, but which we do not produce out of ourselves either voluntarily or in the regular flow of associated ideas; on the contrary, it interrupts that flow, and introduces an influence not our own. By calling it *inward*, we imply that it enters the mind directly, or through some avenues of perception different from those which connect us with the outward world. I do not know whether this statement, which is to myself perfectly clear, will assist in removing any of the difficulties which have occurred to your ingenious correspondent, "The Author of 'Inspiration, how related to Revelation,'" who has honoured me with some criticism in your last number. I understand those who hold the usual view of the resurrection to maintain, that the same body which had been deposited in the grave, consisting of flesh and bones, capable of being handled, and partaking of ordinary human food, was

* We use it, therefore, here in a somewhat different sense from writers on Mental Science when they speak generally of "the facts of consciousness."

manifested to men's outward senses for forty days on earth, and was then taken up into heaven. To me it seems—and I offer my views in no dogmatic or arrogant spirit, but as presenting to my own mind the fewest difficulties—that the manifestation must have been something different from an ordinary impression on the senses, though producing an equally distinct conviction of reality. Some of the statements in the narrative are only explicable, in my view, on this supposition. A spiritual presence could not, I presume, act on a material organ. However clothed, whatever the nature of the glorified body in which it was manifested, it must have addressed itself to some inward sense. This is what I contend for; though the language that we are compelled to use in speaking of such things, unavoidably raises material associations, and so unconsciously blinds us to the real nature of the case.

Two statements of mine are strongly objected to by my friend Mr. Means (C.R., March, 1860): my regarding the testimony of Paul to the risen Christ as superior in weight to that of the evangelists; and my inference from the use of the same word, ὤφθη, to describe *all* Christ's appearances—to Paul *after*, to the other disciples *before*, the ascension—that they could not have occurred in an ordinary human body of flesh and bones. I will consider the last of these points first. Mr. Means argues that because the cognate word ὄμματα means "eyes," "the most natural interpretation of Paul's words is, that the manifestation was to the sense of sight." But there is another cognate word, ὀπτασία, which my friend will hardly deny, as used in the Septuagint and the New Testament, means something different from vision through the bodily eyes. So far as I have observed, it is the counterpart in the Greek Scriptures, of ἀποκάλυψις or φανέρωσις; that which is ἀποκάλυψις on the part of God, being ὀπτασία or ὅραμα on the part of men, the two words expressing correlative aspects of the same transaction.* Daniel (LXX.) x. 1, furnishes an illustration: λόγος ἀπεκαλύφθη τῳ Δανιὴλ—καὶ σύνεσις ἐδόθη 'αυτῷ, ἐν τῇ ὀπτασία; and again, ibid. 7, 8, ἴδον τὴν 'οπτασίαν. So Paul (2 Cor. xii. 1), speaking of his spiritual experiences, says, ἐλεύσομαι εἰς ὀπτασίας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεις κυρίου. In the opening verse of the book of Revelation, we have the two counterparts thus expressed: ἀποκάλυψις I. X. ἣν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ Θεὸς, and ὅσα εἶδε, i.e. John.

* The writers of the New Testament differ singularly from each other in their use of the two words, ἀποκαλύπτω and φανερόω, with their corresponding substantives. The former occurs in Matthew, Luke, and very frequently in Paul, but not once in Mark and Acts, and only once in John, and that in a citation from the LXX. (John xiii. 38). In the Gospel and First Epistle of John, φανερόω takes the place of ἀποκαλύπτω. It is used, with φανέρωσις, in a similar sense by Paul, and occurs twice in Mark, xvi. 12, 14. Among the synonymes of ὀπτασία and ὅραμα, Hesychius (quoted by Biel, sub. v. ὅραμα) places φαντασία; and Phavorinus (cited in the same place) has these words: ὁράματα εἰσι προφητῶν, ὅσα ἐγρηγορότες βλέπουσιν, εἴτε ἐν νυκτὶ, εἴτε ἐν ἡμέρᾳ.

Now whatever explanation be given of these passages, it will not, I presume, be contended that they refer to bodily vision directed to material objects, but rather that they describe what Mr. Jowett would call *inward* facts—the presentment of certain objects to the interior vision of the mind. We are clearly, therefore, not obliged, because ὤφθη has a common root with ὁρᾶσθαι, to understand it of bodily vision; and it is open to us to inquire in which of the two senses, of an outward or of an inward vision, it was most likely to be used by the apostle in the passage under consideration. It will be admitted, I suppose, that Paul's seeing must have been subsequent to the ascension, and that in the passage before us, 1 Cor. xv. 8, it related principally, if not exclusively, to the extraordinary manifestation which produced his conversion, and which he has himself described simply and expressively in the words, ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ (Galat. i. 16). This marks the source of the appearance—that it came from God. Paul's reception of it, on the other hand, is called ὀπτασία (Acts xxvi. 19): οὐκ ἐγενόμην ἀπειθὴς τῇ οὐρανίῳ ὀπτασίᾳ. Was this, could this be, what we understand by *bodily* manifestation? I confess myself wholly unable to comprehend, how flesh and blood, which the apostle declares cannot inherit the kingdom of God (1 Cor. xv. 50), could appear from the spiritual world and then return to it again. I may be dull of apprehension or biassed unconsciously by hypothesis; but I say in all earnestness, that this is something the mere possibility of which passes my conception. Had the appearance been that of a human body, as its approach was announced by a great light and an awful sound, how could the companions of Paul have avoided seeing it also? Yet the manifestation was confined to Paul alone. The three accounts of the event in Acts, though they differ in some respects, agree in this, that his companions saw no man. That there was, however, some personal manifestation of Christ to Paul is evident; and it is remarkable that it is described by the very word which is the subject of our present discussion, ὤφθην σοι. What he then experienced is denoted by a verb of sight, ὧν τε εἶδές; and he is promised a future repetition of similar visions, ὧν τε ὀφθήσομαι σοι (Acts xxvi. 16). It should not be overlooked, as indicating the belief with which these appearances were associated, that Festus speaks contemptuously of Paul's asserting that a certain crucified Jesus was still alive, ὃν ἔφασκεν ζῆν (Acts xxv. 19); and that Paul commences the account of his conversion by asking, why it should be thought incredible that God should raise the dead, εἰ ὁ θεὸς νεκροὺς ἐγείρει (Acts xxvi. 8). If I understand Mr. Means correctly, he maintains that the word ὤφθη must be understood in the same sense of all the appearances referred to in 1 Cor. xv. 5—8, and that this sense is that of "a corporeal manifestation." I, on the other hand, think it evident from the foregoing considerations, that in the case of Paul it

could only have meant an inward or spiritual manifestation; and it seems to me in the highest degree improbable, that he would have used it, without a single remark, of other cases of manifestation, if it had signified in them something entirely different. My friend must allow me to think, that he has affirmed a little peremptorily, that "this argument leads to a conclusion diametrically opposite to the reviewer's." My other friend, Mr. Bache (C. R., March, p. 151), calls the view which I have here put forth, an assumption. But I have assumed nothing. I have stated facts and examined the meaning of words, and I have drawn my inference. It may be a mistaken inference; it may not be Mr. Bache's inference; but it is not an assumption. Mr. Means concludes from Paul's words (1 Cor. xv. 3, 4), "Christ died, was buried, and rose again," that these three things must be predicated of one subject, viz., the body; and inquires, "Where is the sequence or connection of incidents which affect, some only the body, and others only the soul?" I do not feel the pertinence of this question. Even if the same human body was not raised again, but the soul passed at once into its heavenly vehicle, the body must first have died and been buried; and it is to be observed, that the subject here is not σῶμα, but Χριστός, and that the word ἐγήγερται (which, it is to be noticed, is the same with ἐγείρει, Acts xxvi. 8, where the context shews that the reference must be to the ascended Christ) may be understood, without any disruption of logical sequence, of that which is most essentially Christ's, his living soul. The same critic attaches great importance to Christ's prediction of his death on the third day, and thinks that its fulfilment involves the fact of a bodily resurrection. To me this form of speech does not appear necessarily to indicate more than Christ's own conviction that he should rise from the grave to a higher life. It is now admitted by most learned and candid inquirers, that the doctrine of a resurrection acquired new force and distinctness among the Hebrews from their contact with the professors of the Zoroastrian religion during the Babylonish exile. We find it taught in the Zend-avesta, that before the general resurrection the soul passes into an intermediate state, where the good are received into a place of happiness, called Gorodman, and clothed with an ethereal body, and the wicked are thrown into Duzakh or hell; and that immediately after death, the soul remains three days with the body in the grave, and on the fourth passes into Gorodman.* The affinity of this doctrine with notions prevalent among the Jews in the time of Christ is obvious. That his words respecting a resurrection on the third day were understood by his disciples during his life as only a general affirmation of his immortality, seems fairly inferrible from the fact, which Mr. Means lays great stress upon, pp. 148, 149,

* See Rhode, Heilige Sage des Zendvolks, p. 407.

that they did not look for a bodily manifestation, and, according to the synoptical evangelists, were quite incredulous when the rumour of it first reached them. That Christ's foretelling his resurrection on the third day and its asserted occurrence are compatible with the fact of a corporeal manifestation, I do not deny; but I cannot admit with Mr. Means, that they involve a proof of it. Christ's own words, unless we put into them a meaning derived from a later belief, seem to me to establish nothing either on one side or on the other, but to leave the question whether it was a bodily or a spiritual resurrection still open.*

But I must proceed to the consideration of the second point on which I find myself at variance with Mr. Means,—my preference of Paul's testimony to the risen Christ to that of the evangelists. At the outset I must take an exception to the unqualified assertion of my friend,—that an incidental reference in a letter is of less value historically than the fuller statement of a regular narrative, and that it is more reasonable to interpret the former by the latter than *vice versâ*. I am quite at issue with him here. Where the writer of a letter is led incidentally to speak of matters that come within his own experience or observation, and there is no reason for supposing that he has any motive to deceive, we are more likely to see facts in their original form and their proper light, than when they are wrought at a later period into the framework of a general history, written with a special object and conceived from a decided point of view, which must unconsciously bias the author, without any intention of giving a false impression, so to present and group his facts as to make them the exponents of the idea with which his mind is vividly possessed. The longer the interval between the composition of his work and the occurrence of the facts, and the more they have become in

* The term of three days was employed by the Jews to express a short futurity. The reader will recall a remarkable passage in Hosea, vi. 2, which the Septuagint (v. 4) has thus rendered: *ὑγιάσει ἡμᾶς μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας· ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ ἐξαναστησόμεθα, καὶ ζησόμεθα ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ.* Archbishop Newcome observes on this passage, "This seems a proverbial manner of describing an event which would soon happen." He refers to a kindred form of expression in Luke xiii. 32. Looking to the Hebrew idiom alone, I do not see that our Lord's words respecting his resurrection imply more than his belief, shaped in the popular, traditional form, that after a temporary sojourn with the body in the grave, his immortal part would ascend to the higher life in heaven. The discovery of the empty tomb, which all the evangelists record, is, I frankly admit, a difficulty which I am unable satisfactorily to explain. But difficulties press on every view of these mysterious transactions. Without adopting Ewald's supposition, I still do not think it so extremely childish and absurd as Mr. Means represents. The language of John, xix. 42, would of itself not unfairly admit the interpretation that the body was temporarily deposited in the adjacent *κηποτάφιον* of Joseph (see Münter's *Symbola ad interpret. Evang. Johann. ex marmoribus etc. maxime Græcis*, p. 28), in consequence of the near approach of the Preparation Eve. Two reasons are given: *διὰ τὴν παρασκευήν*, and *ὅτι ἐγγὺς ἦν τὸ μνημεῖον*. The invidious imputation on the disciples, alluded to Matthew xxvii. 63, and xxviii. 13—15, shews at least that the story of a secret removal had got early into circulation. But as I do not see my way clearly, I prefer leaving the difficulty as I find it.

the interval the subject of intense interest or earnest controversy, the less will it be possible for any writer, however candid and sincere, unless controlled by a perpetual miracle, to attempt a connected narrative of them, wholly uninfluenced by any previous conception of their nature and significance. If, therefore, we wish to verify any history and to judge of facts for ourselves, it is a great advantage to get at the earliest notice of those facts, and to trace them if possible to their original source. A survey of the materials of history is sometimes necessary to a complete and comprehensive estimate of the history itself. This is not to impeach the integrity of the historian, but only to get the benefit of testing his judgment by our own. Paul makes little or no allusion to the events of the public ministry of Christ. He refers indeed distinctly to his death, burial and resurrection, but briefly and without going into particulars; and his reference, I think, is to the events themselves, known by tradition, and not to any written narrative of them. Where we have the opportunity of comparing his own notice of a fact with the fuller detail of the book of Acts, as in the case of his conversion, the brevity and simplicity of his statement are strongly in favour of its perfect credibility; so that if on any occasion there should seem to be a discrepancy between Paul and the Acts (on all essential points they are in unison), I should certainly construe the history from the letters, and not the letters from the history.*

With respect to chronology, I feel no doubt that I shall have the unhesitating assent of Mr. Means, Mr. Bache and the Unitarian Minister, when I assert that we can fix to a certainty within a few years the dates of all the principal letters of the apostle Paul. This I still think we cannot do in regard to any one of our four Gospels. I have not asserted (Mr. Means must have misunderstood me) that they could not be traced in their present form to an earlier time than the second half of the second century, but that "we find no distinct allusion to any of them by name" before that time, and that "in *their actual form* none of them can be *proved* to have been written anterior to the destruction of Jerusalem." (C. R., January, p. 43.) In the form in which we now possess them, it seems to me impossible to assign to any of them a date at all approaching in precision to that which we can ascertain for all the principal Pauline epistles. To go into this question at sufficient length to be satisfactory, would far exceed the limits of such a paper as the present. To establish the purely negative conclusion, which is all that I at present contend for, as contrasted with the positive chronology

* Paul's language in referring to his conversion is remarkable and significant: ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ (Gal. i. 15). Keeping in view what I have already said on ἀποκαλύπτω and its correlative terms, we may observe that it corresponds here, as exhibiting the *divine* side of the transaction, to ὤφθη (1 Cor. xv. 8) and to ὀπτασίᾳ (Acts xxvi. 19).

attainable for the Pauline letters, it may be enough to refer to the diversity of opinion existing among the most learned men. Erasmus, Lardner, Hug and Bleek, maintain that Matthew was originally written in Greek. Klener, the author of a learned prize essay, published at Göttingen, 1832, has attempted to shew, with the concurrence of the late professor Lücke, and, I think, has shown, that the original Matthew, spoken of by Papias, was written in Hebrew; that from this our present Matthew has been derived, but when or by whom or with what additions, it is now impossible to say; and that the affinity of our Matthew with the gospel of the Hebrews in use among the Jewish Christians, is best explained on the supposition, that both works flowed through different channels, each with some additions peculiar to itself, from the same Hebrew or Aramaic original. One of the most eminent of living critics, a distinguished ornament of our body, in an admirable paper communicated some years ago to the Prospective Review, adduced some very powerful reasons for considering Mark as the earliest of the evangelists.* Ebrard and Bleek, writers of high repute on the conservative side of German theology, carrying with them the concurrence of De Wette, maintain that he is the latest, finding traces in him of having used even John. The various written materials referred to by Luke as his sources, prove that his cannot have been a very early work; but we cannot fix its date. When John's Gospel was written, and whether the work bearing his name is authentic, is one of the questions still eagerly debated by theologians of opposite schools on the continent. Language is often employed on this subject which seems to me singularly inappropriate. The texture of our three first Gospels and their curious relation to each other, shew that they did not originate like ordinary books, produced all at once by a single effort; but that they were rather a cumulative growth,—the various materials of which they consist, records at first of particular discourses or transactions, long perhaps the property of private individuals, and circulated from hand to hand with ever fresh accretions, being only gradually collected and combined and reduced to the form in which we now have them. The prevailing belief that the end of the world was at hand, never permitted the first generation of Christians to think of writing a work for posterity. The earliest gospel was oral. If written memoranda were made, they were for the use of individuals. Even Mr. Norton adopts Gieseler's theory of an oral gospel, out of which our three first immediately grew, as the best mode of explaining the mingled agreement and discrepancy with which they are related to each other. I cannot indeed adopt this view myself. To me it is evident, that written documents of greater or less extent, *minora quædam historiarum corpora*, as Lachmann calls

* Article iii. No. xxi. Vol. VI. 1850.

them,* themselves derived from various sources, must have intervened between the primitive oral tradition and the full gospels which we now possess. The idea of a canonical or authoritative Scripture does not appear to have been distinctly entertained till the rise of the conservative reaction against the wild disorganizing tendencies of Gnostic speculation and Montanist fanaticism at the end of the second century. Mr. Means expresses his surprise at the plastic character ascribed to the faith of the first age, and at the general, unopposed change that is supposed to have been silently proceeding from A.D. 50 to A.D. 150. Now we have very little direct record of what was going on at all during this space of time. It is a period of singular obscurity. But all accessible evidence seems to indicate that the great means of influence and instruction were still chiefly oral, aided here and there by a nascent literature slowly emerging out of tradition. In this transitional state, and till it is fixed by an authoritative literature, popular belief must of necessity be to a certain extent plastic; and while it faithfully preserves and transmits great ideas and the remembrances of a great teacher, especially with the aid of brief authentic memoranda of what he said and did, it is inevitable that in matters of subordinate and historical detail, not affecting the grounds of trust and reverence, it should undergo some change through the very growth and vitality of the ideas themselves. In treating of the possibility of such change, to repel it by talking of corruption, tampering and substitution, is really to take for granted the point in dispute; to judge a whole preceding century from the point of view which had been gained towards the close of the second; to assume that our three first Gospels had existed exactly in their present form from the beginning; and to deny, what everything in their actual composition and the earliest traces of their existence renders probable, that they were in the first instance a growth gradually evolved out of tradition by the spiritual demands of the church. When the Unitarian Minister asserts that "the authorship of the Gospels is quite as well proved as that of the Æneid, the Metamorphoses, the Gallic War and the Catilinian Conspiracy," he overlooks the difference between books that were issued into the world by a regular publication in Rome, and which are constantly quoted by well-known authors, such as Velleius Paterculus, Martial, Propertius, Quintilian, Suetonius and the author "de causis corruptæ eloquentiæ," through the ensuing century almost from the date of their appearance,—and books which have evidently from their mutual relation been largely composed of materials collected from private sources, and arranged, it may be, in the first instance, by those whose names they bear, but

* De Ordine Narrationum in Evangeliis Synopticis (Theolog. Stud. et Krit. 1835. 3).

which, it is a fact, are never once cited by name for a century at least after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, and which from the way in which they were circulated, must almost have retained the character of unpublished writings some way down into the second century. This distinction, which, observe, I do not assume, but which is an inference from extant facts, does not at all affect the character of the New-Testament writings as vehicles of religious influence and instruction. They are the record and expression of a deep, spiritual movement pervading the popular masses of society, rather than deliberate productions of literary thoughtfulness and skill. Their popular character authenticates them. The elements of which they consist, breathe of the age which sent them forth into the world. Their very literary deficiencies, their partial failure to meet the demands of a strict historical criticism, adds to their religious value, as indicating the depth and fervour of the faith and love out of which they sprung. We cannot doubt that they transmit to us through various channels the mind and spirit of Christ. For we know from the invaluable fragments of Papias, preserved in Eusebius, that the first things reduced to writing were the discourses of Christ, τὰ λόγια τοῦ Κύριον, and that these formed, early in the apostolic age, the nucleus of our present Gospels. As Christ's discourses were all occasional, such records must have possessed from the first something of a historical character. These primitive collections were variously combined, arranged and distributed in the larger works which grew by degrees out of their fragmentary beginnings; and they appear to have been religiously preserved, as containing the words of Christ himself, however the historical cement in which they were embedded, was increased and modified by the later accretions of tradition. It is in the discourses of Christ that the agreement of the three first evangelists with each other is most remarkable; here it is often strictly verbal. It is outside the discourses, where rumour and tradition had freer play, that their variations commence, and are often irreconcilable. Then there is the grand personality of Christ himself in the centre of all these narratives, so unique, original and self-consistent. We feel certain no popular enthusiasm could raise out of its teeming fancy such a character as that. We are sure, some great historical reality must lie behind it. Every one feels, that the Christ of the New Testament in himself and in the effects which he produces on the human soul, is and must be a reality. The religion of Christ is revealed and embodied in the person of Christ. This is of more value to us than his particular words or his particular acts; for these were often shaped and limited by the occasion which called them forth. It is the spirit which underlies them and glows through them, it is the spiritual power of his wonderful and gracious personality—the Divine speaking and acting through the Human—which touches the

soul with a religious sympathy, fills it with faith and love, and draws it into union with Christ, as Christ by a higher exercise of the same affections is already one with God. So long as this living Christ is preserved to us, we possess the eternal substance of his religion. Not only, therefore, are the minute historical details of the evangelical narrative of less importance to us, on this spiritual view of our relation to Christ and of the value of his religion; but the very consciousness that we are compelled by the results of an honest criticism to allow a certain latitude of interpretation in dealing with some portions of the history, instead of being unfriendly to a devout sense of our manifold obligations to Christ, aids our deliverance from that servile subjection to the letter, which killeth, and puts us more completely in possession of that spiritual freedom without which religion can never grow up into its full power and dimension within us.

(To be concluded in the next No.)

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE STATUE OF DR. PRIESTLEY AT OXFORD.

SIR,

WITH deep pleasure did I read the report contained in the last No. of the Christian Reformer respecting the placing of a Statue of Dr. Priestley in the new Museum at Oxford. The vividness of my interest may be slightly owing to my having a few months ago spent a few days in the vicinity of the Museum and surveyed its beauty: a most worthy receptacle will it be for the images of the great men of whom statues are there to be placed. But the principal ground of my satisfaction is the proof which the report contains that at least some Unitarians are not slow to seize a good opportunity for bearing emphatic testimony to the great qualities and manifold and enduring services of one of the great lights of our Unitarian church and of the world at large. Too indifferent, at least in conduct, have we hitherto been to what we owe to the excellent and distinguished names which are at once the *decus et tutamen* of our denomination. Of Newton, Milton and Locke, we have *talked* indeed *usque ad nauseam;* but what have we *done* to make their real merits known in general, and to make their high qualities familiar and dear to our children? Yet, if any church has a spiritual ancestry of an ennobling and blessed tendency, that church is ours. Why, then, is there not even a good biographical memoir of either of the three, portrayed chiefly in a religious light? Cannot something be now done to relieve us from this apparent neglect? A finer subject for a competent pen than "The Life of Joseph Priestley" could not easily be found. Would that some one, having both the scientific and theological knowledge requisite, would undertake the task! Such a likeness of the man would be even more useful than a statue in the Oxford Museum; for

while the latter will be fixed to one point, and so accessible to only a few, the former would travel over the world, and make known to tens of thousands the varied excellences of one who was morally great as well as pious, learned and scientific. It will be a happy thing if this Oxford business should lead to the shewing of a practical interest in such qualities of mind, heart and character as those of Dr. Priestley. By no means am I disposed to man-worship. As little am I a friend to the neglect of venerable memories. The past is meant for religious and moral impression, as much as the future is meant for stimulus and hope, and the present for work. From that past we Unitarians extract but little of the higher nutriment in which it is so rich. Let us unlearn our error. Why should not this opportunity occasion efforts in more ways than one to make Priestley known in his own true qualities? With the many, his is a name of fear and reproach: are we blameless in this particular? If the ordinary literature has done him injustice, has he received his due at our hands? I hope to see a change for the better, and with that view will conclude with one or two additional suggestions.

I presume that it will not be difficult to obtain copies of the statue when executed. Hackney, Birmingham and Leeds, will surely be glad to procure a copy; and I should hope that Manchester and other towns not having the special reasons which may be supposed to actuate the Unitarians of those three places, will be desirous of profiting by the opportunity. I do not know that it would be possible to form a *Priestley Gallery* out of the portraits, medallion, works, &c. of that good man, but at least materials cannot be wanting to make a room specially interesting to persons who in May next may attend the Association meetings from the country. When, too, the time comes for placing the statue on its pedestal in the Museum, I presume that Mr. James Yates and others, to whom I for one feel indebted for the part they have taken, will make a visit to Oxford; and why should there not be some inauguration observances? I think so good an opportunity for preaching the simple gospel of the New Testament in that centre of mediæval Christianity should not be lost.

Speaking of public ministrations, I am reminded of the good that would ensue if ministers were to deliver, either in their pulpits or class-rooms, lectures illustrative of the life, views, labours and discoveries of Priestley. Possibly our brethren of the United States, who, as affording the Christian and philosophic sufferer an asylum when driven from his native land by a Church-and-King mob, have a solid claim to share in the honour of commemorating the services he rendered to his kind, would, if an overture were made to them by the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, be willing to join in some general method of expressing toward his memory the love and reverence of the Unitarian church. I have long thought that a visit to Dr. Priestley's birth-place would be beneficial as well as interesting. Your report has revived and strengthened the feeling. Probably others may be willing to join in such a mark of fraternal regard, with yours truly,

Manchester, March 5, 1860. JOHN R. BEARD.

"REVIVALS" FROM IRELAND.

SIR,

On Thursday, Feb. 23, the inhabitants of Hackney were invited to hear, from the Rev. S. J. Moore, of Ballymena,—a gentleman referred to in the able papers on "Revivals" which have appeared in your Magazine,—an account of the "Glorious Work of God in the North of Ireland." The largest room in the place was much too small for the multitude who sought admission; not only was the interior crammed, but the several entrances were besieged by a crowd of evidently anxious listeners, shewing that this "revival" movement has excited the deep interest of no small portion of our own population.

I happened, for a short time, to be within ear-shot of the reverend gentleman, and a few sentences which reached me may, I think, be useful to some of our Unitarian friends, if you will permit me to chronicle them in your pages. With all the earnestness of a man who had himself undergone a vital "change," Mr. Moore described what he had seen and done. His statements must have made a deep impression on many who heard him, consisting, as a large part of his audience did, of persons of small cultivation, in whose religion, generally, *dread of the future* is the prevailing element. Poor things! I glanced at the eager, anxious faces of not a few—the humble, kind-hearted women more especially—with feelings of unmixed pity. In its power thus to work on the fears of the timid and less intelligent, lies the main strength of "orthodoxy." Remove the principle of *fear* from the religion of many whom it influences, and how much of religion would there be left?

But the part of Mr. Moore's address which more particularly struck me was this. He had attended, he said, not fewer than seventy "revival" meetings, and witnessed their influence on persons of various creeds and degrees of intelligence. Not only had Catholics, but even Socinians, felt their power; and there was this striking characteristic in every instance of "conversion,"—that former errors of opinion were at once renounced, and the changed one saw ground of hope only in the "atoning blood" of Christ, and addressed the deep outpourings of his heart "exclusively to the Lord Jesus"!

It may be so, and all this the special work of God's Holy Spirit. Mr. Moore said the "converted" knew it was, because they *felt* it to be so. If feeling is a reliable test of truth in one case, why should it not be in another? But if it be so—and this is the point to which I would specially draw the attention of your readers and certain speakers at a late District Unitarian Society meeting—what becomes of our Unitarian faith? The teachings of "the Spirit" cannot, on important points of religious doctrine, be one thing to one man, and a directly opposite thing to another man. The unavoidable result, therefore, would seem to me to be, that the Unitarian who can discern the working of God's Spirit in these revivals, must necessarily admit the absence of all truth in the distinguishing features of his own creed.

Hackney, March 3, 1860. G.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

The Revelation of God and Man in the Son of God and the Son of Man: Six Sermons preached in Renshaw-Street Chapel, Liverpool. By John Hamilton Thom. Pp. 142. London—Whitfield.*

It we attempted to characterize the tone of thought perceptible throughout these Discourses, we should be disposed to say of it that it is, in the best sense of the word, intensely Pauline. It is an honourable distinction, and one very naturally associated with the philosophy which Mr. Thom maintains. Whatever may be thought of that philosophy, Mr. Thom has secured, by means of it, an immense advantage, in being able to read the apostle of the Gentiles in a purer, more generous and religious light than that in which his difficult sayings have been long and commonly interpreted. It may perhaps be found that the peculiar freshness and vigour of these Discourses is partly due to novelty of expression, and that the doctrine which is here taught of God and Christ and of religion, of Christian evidence and of inspiration, has not been wanting in the writings of other liberal and Unitarian divines. The same phenomenon appears in the comparison of St. Paul with the evangelists and with the older scriptural writers. The truth which he presents in a novel form is often identical in substance with what had been spoken by Psalmists and Prophets in a more simple, if in a less pointed manner. Mr. Thom has followed in St. Paul the example of concentrated thought, and the result in both cases appears in a certain philosophic unity of conception,—which, however, it requires great sympathy with the point of view of the writer to receive with entire, unquestioning assent or appreciation. Mr. Thom, in his definition of religion, brings the element of feeling into greater prominence than is sometimes allowed to it in Unitarian writings; at the same time he treats the question of proofs of divine revelation with the utmost Pauline freedom; and yet he is so thoroughly Unitarian in his convictions, while holding firmly to the revealed character of the Christian doctrine, that he is felt to be in real sympathy with every form of genuine Christian life and thought amongst ourselves or others. Even those who profess dislike of the cold, negative character which they have learned to attribute to the Unitarianism in which they have been brought up, and who, in utter ignorance of what Calvinism truly is, have begun to look with hopeful longings in that mistaken direction, may find in these Discourses something that shall allay the restless craving of their dissatisfaction. Yet if the truth of the Unitarian doctrine appears to differ in the work before us from what these persons read in others of our body, the difference, they may be assured, is just of the very kind that distinguishes the Epistles of St. Paul from others of the scriptural writings. It was natural that the early forms of Unitarian thought should have moulded themselves upon the simplicity of the evangelists, and upon those portions of the New-Testament Epistles which uttered the divine truth in language that even the most rigid orthodoxy could not deprive of its plain humanitarian and Arminian sense. But Mr. Thom will be allowed to have rendered an eminent service to the cause

* Continued from p. 178.

of Christian truth, if he shall have aided to rescue the Pauline doctrine, the supposed stronghold of Calvinism, from the reckless abuse of that misinterpretation.

From the rich variety of striking passages which might be quoted in illustration of Mr. Thom's method of teaching, we select, almost at random, the following, a portion of the first discourse, on "Christ tempted in all Points like as we are."

"It is not then because of the compassion of God only, it is because of the Holiness of God, we can be confident that with the eternal energies of His Spirit He will promote every desire in the heart, every effort in the life, to escape from evil and to be at peace with Him. We ask no protection against a holy God: He *is* our refuge and protection; for we know that a holy Being must help us to be holy,—must mourn over and seek us as long as we are unholy: if there was any unholiness in Him, He might be unforgiving. God forgives, not because He is lenient to sin, but because he utterly abhors it, and delights to lend Himself to every attempt to break its yoke, to deliver for ever from its bondage, by meeting every sighing of the spirit after Himself. Our Lord forgave, not because he made light of transgression, not because he took an indulgent view of our temptations, not because he thought any man tried beyond his strength, beyond the strength that was open to him if he chose to apply for it,—but because he sought to retrieve the Divine image in every man, and therefore would break no bruised reed, would quench no smoking flax, but would help Righteousness to victory if it shewed but a spark of life. He was tempted in all points to resent injury, by being exposed, even as we are, to every conceivable form of ingratitude, of insult, and of wrong: and he was tempted, even as we are, to abate something of his revolt from moral evil that he might the more readily sympathize with the sinner,—but he escaped the temptation on this side too, and never forgave otherwise than out of his sympathy with what is good and holy. Observe all his forms of Forgiveness: Thy *faith* hath saved thee: She is forgiven, for she *loves* much: Go in peace, and sin no more. Faith, Love, Penitential Sorrow—these affinities with God, these drawings of the spirit heavenwards, these approaches to the Righteous One—he gave them his countenance, he helped them to effect a perfect deliverance."—Pp. 27, 28.

Another passage, from the fourth sermon, on "The Unitarian Position—Devotional and Pastoral," exhibits the spirit in which Mr. Thom replies to a kind of objection commonly urged against us. He is pointing out certain manifest advantages which ought to favour the habit of Unitarian devotion,—advantages denied in the nature of things to those whose idea of God and of Christ is confused and mystical, and whose conception of the spiritual life excludes it from all relation with nature.

"Whence, then, this appearance of coldness?—for the appearance at least is, I suppose, testified against us. Will it be said, that is owing to our Faith? If so, will any one tell us what element is absent from our Devotion that appeared in the prayers of Christ? I speak not of their intensity—for who prayed like him?—but of the elements of Faith, the doctrine of God, that led that intensity. It cannot be owing to our form of worship, for we have that in common with the most emotional Christians,—and the Churches that are most of Ritual and of Liturgy are commonly praised as bulwarks against fanaticism and the irregular fervours of the spirit. Or, is it that the spiritual atmosphere in which we strive to breathe is too pure for us—that we use too little of symbol in using only the Universe and Christ? Is our Piety really cold, or does it only appear so to others because we do not use their media of expression? When the Roman Catholic falls down before his symbol on the pavement of a Church, apparently absorbed in the midst of careless and shifting crowds,—be it the Real Presence on the Altar, or the Virgin Mother

within her shrine, or the reflection of God from some sainted face whose flesh the spirit has worn away,—is there more of real feeling, reserving for the present the quality of the feeling, because there is more of the intense and passionate sign? We naturally think that there is more, because we see more of its expression. What is the reason of that peculiarity which must have struck all observers with astonishment in Catholic countries,—the utter absence of reserve in giving open expression to the secret worship of the soul, in going through all the attitudes even of a rapt Devotion, in the presence of those who are only idle spectators? Does it not go along with habitual symbolism, with consecrated media of expression, with formulated worship? Is not the soul casting itself upon the recognised vehicle, rather than carried face to face with the living God? If spirit was meeting Spirit, could there be this intense engagement with the outward sign? Would that abandonment of all reserve be possible unless the soul was alone with God, or in a community of worshippers where each spirit was felt to be as in a closet of its own? If not, then are we to *mediatise* our Devotion that its flame may burn more thickly—that we may have less reverence and reserve in giving it *expression*? Are we to have less direct communion with God, that through symbols and litanies we may speak more freely of Him? It may seem a strange fact that Christianity should not yet have moulded itself into a perfect form of worship, universally accepted; but the fact that it has not, may indicate that it was not intended to do so,—that in every Church, as in every Soul, and in every fresh act of the Soul, the Spirit must be newly born."—Pp. 92—94.

In speaking upon this topic of Unitarian devotion, Mr. Thom addresses to our community wise counsel, which we gladly commend to the serious consideration of well-meaning but injudicious friends of the truth which we all agree to profess and honour.

"Whether our Devotion has been in any way commensurate with these fostering influences from God and from His Truth, I would deem it not healthy to ask. Certain I am that Devotion never will be kindled by our applying to it the irritant stimulants of our own discontent with its condition,—that never will it warm and grow under the eye of our criticism and inspection,—but only by turning its own eye outwards in self-oblivion upon its glorious Object. If we have any reason, or suspect we have any reason, to be dissatisfied with our Piety, we must neither fret at it nor scold it, but simply hold our souls to receive the blessed Image of Him who alone can feed it from Himself. Self-examination will never bring a divine glow upon any of the springs of our spiritual life: the only examination that can transfigure us is the knowledge of ourselves that comes from the Light of God shining into our darkness: only when we look into *His* face do we know how poor we are, and yet how infinitely rich. You know it is commonly said by others, and I suppose believed, that our Piety is cold,—though *who* could be blameless judges of that, or *what* instruments God could have given them to make such measurements, it might be difficult to say."—Pp. 90, 91.

"And now, to recur for a moment to the allegation against us of coldness and feebleness as a sect, though sect we are not,—that is, we do not separate ourselves from the Universal Church,—may I offer a word of mixed encouragement and counsel? Our religious atmosphere seems charged with restlessness, and we are largely engaged in the least edifying of all employments,—self-criticism spoken in public. Now I deem that there is high wisdom and religion in being content even with our deficiencies, if they seem to come out of our providential lot and position, and not of voluntary fault or uncongeniality of heart. Let us rest—not abide, but rest—in what we are, if what we are be only genuine and dutiful,—let us wait and work patiently within the sphere that is clear to us until God elects us to something better, and not corrupt our *hearts* by the aimless motions of a blind discontent. There is much of lame-

tation that seems to me utterly unhealthy; it may ground itself on many discouraging facts, but it is not wise in its issues, nor refreshing in its own spirit. It may be that we are not the Church, nor the men, that the times require,—but not the less we are what we are by the grace of God. There may be multitudes waiting for a word to be spoken to them with power, but if we keep back no word that *is given to us*, then they must wait till God sends the servants who are inspired to speak the word they want. Meanwhile what is our duty? Is it to be blind to these things? Is it to be satisfied with ourselves? Is it to fall into any languid fatalisms? No,—but to be faithful and true, and ever hopeful, because God knows where and how He wants us; and if, without any known unfaithfulness of ours, we *are* weak and small, then let us be content to be weak and small, and make no swollen efforts at greatness. For my own part I am contented to see a great work waiting to be done, and to know that not yet are we equal to the doing of it, if *that*, though no doubt it is humanly depressing, is yet the discipline that God has provided for us. But if I am contented to wait God's time though I see as it were the coming glory, and know that others will gather it,—that at a day, perhaps not far distant, some Man sent of God will speak the word that will then seem so clear and simple that a child might have uttered it, and we shall all wonder how we missed it,—a word before which our sects shall disappear and roll together like drops of water,—there is yet one thing with which I will never be content, and that is, to hold back one word of the Testimony that is given to us in the measure of utterance that God affords,—nor to suffer others to hold it back without planting in their conscience the broken barbs of all those arrows of Light which their faithlessness has quenched."—Pp. 99, 100.

"I hear and read much about our not fulfilling our Mission with which I have no kind of sympathy,—which seems to me to partake more of human ambition than of divine obedience. If any man can do better let him do it—if he can speak better let him speak it—but let him not waste his breath or time in idle moanings about what he calls success,—unless he means success in saving sinners, nor canker his own freshness and naturalness by judgment of his brethren. To all such I would say,—Shew us the way if you know it—give out the Light if you have it—let all men hear the word of Truth that is in you—let them gaze upon the face of a diviner Beneficence if it has dawned upon you—shew us that you really have what is fair and good, and we will follow you with blessings,—but if you have none of these things, we will not regard your restlessness and discontent as a divine sign—if you are only impatient with what is, and will not wait for God to evolve what is better out of your simplicity and truth, you may see with a very keen and bare eye into the poverty of the Actual, but the serene beauty of what is Coming has not yet risen on your soul.—Let us beware lest when we are wearying ourselves with what we call our want of success, we be impatient only that God has not given greater glory to ourselves."—Pp. 103, 104.

We shall not affect to say that our body has reason to be entirely satisfied with itself, or that we have accomplished all the good that has been fairly within our reach. Yet, surely, whatever improvement we have the proper right to look for, we shall do well to seek from other motives than the vulgar aspiration after a greater worldly success. We are not prepared to abandon our noble distinction of a reasonable, not to say a philosophic faith. We are not disposed to reduce the glorious simplicity of our belief in the Father's goodness to the level of a mystifying and superstitious theology. We cannot appeal, as the revivalists do, to the terror of Satan and his eternal hell, by way of stirring up the fearful excitement which the people mistake for the warmth of pious fervour. By what right, then, do any look for the results amongst us of a kind of preaching which we justly reprobate as unworthy of God and of Christian truth? We have undoubtedly much to learn; but we

are supplied already with abundant motives to greater activity and to the culture of increased faithfulness and zeal in the cause of righteousness: we have little of good to hope for if we allow ourselves to seek the stimulus to our Christian duty in the false direction of mere popular successes.

Lectures on the Atonement, delivered in the Northgate-End Chapel, Halifax. By Russell Lant Carpenter, B.A. Lecture First—Slight and slighting Views of Sin—The Jailor at Philippi.

Mr. CARPENTER here gives us the first of a series of lectures in reply to the recent work of Mr. Mellor on the Atonement. It is clear, scriptural and powerful. We are glad that Mr. Carpenter thus steps forward to defend the simplicity of the gospel. Infidel lecturers avail themselves of orthodox statements like those of Mr. Mellor in order to throw discredit on Christianity. The common people of our manufacturing districts, a shrewd but ill-informed class, take such representations as undeniable statements of Christian doctrine, and draw conclusions hostile to revealed religion. In such a state of things, Unitarians seem especially set for the defence of the gospel. They, and they alone, can defend its evidences and truth. We heard with great satisfaction that on the occasion of a recent infidel lecture at Ashton-under-Lyne by that versatile and unscrupulous person, Joseph Barker, the Rev. John Gordon claimed a hearing at the close of the lecture, and then exposed the injustice of the views given of Christian doctrine, and before quitting the room rebuked Mr. Barker for his suppression of the truth. Mr. Barker, like others of his class, finds it convenient to attack Christianity through the sides of orthodoxy; but *he* at least knows that there is another representation of Christian truth which combines reasonableness with fair Scripture interpretation. Mr. Gordon, we are informed, made a deep impression on some who heard him. Let our ministers be alert, and fearlessly stand forward in like manner in their several districts for the defence of religion.

Pamphlets recently received.

WE have only space to mention the titles of several interesting pamphlets. From Rev. Henry Green, of Knutsford, and Rev. John Ellis, of Diss, we have two very interesting and in their scope congenial discourses,—the former on "The Mother in her Household," the memorial of a departed friend; the latter, "The Christian's Home," occasioned by the summons of a poor and blind and aged Christian who had gone to her Father. From Rev. David Davis, of Norwich, we have a judicious rebuke of some local bigotry at Norwich, entitled, "Are Unitarians Christians?" preceded by a sermon on Truth. We have also received a copy of the fourth edition of the Rev. Joseph Hutton's Devotional Exercises, revised by his son, Rev. Dr. Hutton. The value of this devotional volume is known to many hundreds of families. From Dr. Samuel Osgood we have "The Broad Altar," the first sermon in the "Broad Church Pulpit," a plea for religious liberty in union with a catholic spirit. "The Bottomless Pit,"—not so much a refutation of the horrible doctrine of an everlasting place of torment, as an exposition *of the hell* which the sinner creates in this life.

INTELLIGENCE.

OPENING SERVICES AT THE "CHURCH OF THE SAVIOUR" AT SOUTHAMPTON.

The opening of the handsome Unitarian church at Southampton, on Thursday, March 22, is an event of considerable importance both to that town and to the general Unitarian public. The past history of the town has already inscribed in its annals some marks of interest bearing on religious liberty and Protestant Nonconformity. In the reign of Elizabeth, Southampton gave a hospitable welcome to a number of emigrants from the Netherlands, Protestant refugees, the victims of the persecution of the Duke of Alva. These emigrants brought with them virtuous and industrious habits and manufacturing skill, and the consequence was that the town was for a series of years considerably enriched by the establishment of the cloth manufacture. The Puritan element previously existing in Southampton was strengthened by this immigration of men and women so attached to their religious principles as to be ready to sacrifice the comforts of their native land rather than do violence to them. When the Act of Uniformity, in 1662, tried the resolution and religious honour of the English clergy, two clergymen were found in Southampton to whom truth and conscience were dearer than the livings of St. Michael and Allhallows, Mr. Robinson and Mr. Giles Say. The former continued to reside in Southampton, and by his life and sufferings, as well as by teaching from house to house, bore to the last a steady testimony to Nonconformity. Mr. Giles Say, the ejected vicar of St. Michael, opened and licensed his house, when the Declaration of Indulgence gave a temporary lull to persecution, as the place of meeting and worship for a Congregational church. Both the clergymen named afterwards suffered imprisonment in the town gaol on account of their religious fidelity. A fellow-sufferer of theirs was the father of the great Isaac Watts, a schoolmaster of some repute in the town and a deacon of the Congregational church. There is an affecting tradition, that during the imprisonment of her husband and his pastors, the wife of the good deacon was to be often seen seated on a stone near the prison door, having in her arms her infant son, afterwards the distinguished divine and sacred lyrical poet. If herself denied access to her husband, she possibly thought some one admitted within might carry to him tidings of those he most loved on earth, or might convey to herself words of tenderness from the prisoner. Southampton and its Nonconformity is especially honoured by its connection with Dr. Isaac Watts. "With it," as the preacher remarked in the dedication sermon, "is entwined the imperishable name and genius of that great man whose harp has attuned the English tongue to sacred song scarcely only in a less degree than did that of David the language of the Holy Land. Here that sweet singer of England drew his first breath; here his cradle was rocked by the fierce gales of religious persecution; here he gained the rudiments of that varied intellectual cultivation which afterwards diffused itself over so many departments of human knowledge; here he began, and for the benefit in the first instance of the Nonconformist church of the place, those sacred songs which have since been sung wherever the English tongue has penetrated. Here he drew in his first religious inspiration and the love of freedom which marked his character through life."

The growth of Unitarianism in Southampton was not an offshoot of its early Nonconformity, but was planted by new comers to the town. Some five-and-forty years ago, an unsuccessful attempt was made by Mr. Benjamin Travers to establish an Unitarian congregation in the town. Contributions from other places enabled him to build a small chapel, but his own illness suspended the scheme, and no one else was found to take it up. The present establishment of Unitarianism goes back some eight or ten years. It was a missionary effort on the part of the Southern Unitarian Society, designed and largely carried into effect by the hopeful and indomitable zeal of the present pastor of the Church of the Saviour. Mr. Philip Brannon, removing to Southampton from Newport a few years ago, carried with him the influence and spirit of Mr. Kell, then of Newport, and opened his house for Unitarian worship,—curiously enough, nearly on the spot where now he has had the pleasure of designing and erecting a beautiful Unitarian temple. We need not dwell on the other stages of the progress of this church, worshiping first in the Philosophical Hall, then in a small chapel purchased from the Methodists, but situated in a very disagreeable part of the town. The settlement of Mr. Kell at Southampton, a few years ago, was a happy circumstance for the Unitarian cause there. He con-

ceived the bold plan of erecting a church on a handsome scale in one of the best situations of the town. To the wonder of all who knew the difficulties in the way, he has by his earnest appeals both to the little flock at Southampton and to the friends of the cause elsewhere succeeded in raising more than £2000, and a singularly beautiful structure has been built. We are enabled to give with our present number an engraving, by means of which our readers will form a good idea of the appearance and general character of the building.

The day fixed for the opening fortunately proved fine, and as the hour approached for the dedicatory service groups of worshipers and their friends from many distant places were seen approaching, or scanning with deep interest the new building. We shall append to this article an architectural description of it, only remarking here that the general appearance, both without and within, is harmonious and beautiful. It has ample light; the seats (there are no pews) are commodious; the pulpit (often a blemish in modern churches) handsome; the fittings of the communion-table, with its stone rails and its lectern, in excellent taste and keeping with the rest of the building. At the foot of the pulpit stairs stands the stone font, very symmetrical, and on this occasion strewed with beautiful flowers, some of the early floral offerings of the tardy year. Soon after the service began, the church was pretty well filled. Among the attendants, in addition to the congregation of Southampton, were Sir John Bowring; Mr. Blundell, of Hull; Mr. Alfred Lawrence, Mr. Edward Nettlefold and Dr. Longstaff, of London; Mr. W. Wansey, of Bognor; Mr. Colfox, of Bridport; Mr. Filliter, of Wareham; Mr. F. Schwann, late of Huddersfield, now of Stockbridge; Mr. John Bishop, of Dorchester; Mr. Ilsley, of Newbury; Mr. Kenrick, of Jersey; Mr. Cox, of Honiton; Mr. Shepherd, of Portsmouth; Mr. Hamilton, of Poole; Mr. Mortimer, of Horndean; Mr. Williams, of Tunbridge Wells. There were also many ladies from Wareham, Royston, Portsmouth and other distant places. The ministers present were, Rev. Edmund Kell, the pastor of the church; Rev. J. Panton Ham; Rev. Henry Hawkes and Rev. T. Foster, of Portsmouth; Rev. H. Howse, of Reading; Rev. R. Shelley, of Newbury; Rev. M. Rowntree, of Poole; Rev. M. Davidson, of Wareham; Rev. Mr. M'Ferran, of Newport; and Rev. R. B. Aspland.

Soon after eleven o'clock, Rev. Edmund Kell entered the pulpit, clad in a handsome silk gown presented to him the evening before by the members of his congregation. The words of prayer, which were the first religious utterance within these walls, were very solemn and were spoken not without emotion. Next followed this hymn, composed for the occasion:

All Glorious God! to Thee this place,
Sacred to things unseen, we give;
For not to Sense alone we live,
When quickened by redeeming grace.

Supremely great Thy law of love,—
Justice with Mercy richly fraught;
The end of Discipline and Thought;—
The pure heart sees around, above.

Yet dim is Duty's signal, save
Read in the blaze of Gospel light:
And Sin this dimness turns to night,
And Nature leaves us in the grave.

How blest'd the faith the Gospel yields!
A balm for sorrowing guilt it proves;
Shews when he chides the Father loves;
And Death with hopes immortal gilds.

When, felt the soul's deep wants, we come
To worship here with one accord,
In spirit may we meet the Lord,—
The Saviour's Church, our mystic home!

The psalmody of the service was assisted by the organ, which was a few years ago a gift from Jersey on the breaking up of the chapel in that island. It appeared on this occasion renovated with a Gothic case suitable to the rest of the church. The place proved itself well adapted for the human voice, whether in single or combined utterance. The Scriptures read by Mr. Kell were Psalm xxvii. and John iv. When the introductory service was nearly finished, Rev. R. Brook Aspland entered the pulpit. He commenced his address with these words: "My first duty is a painful one; for I have to explain why it is that Dr. Beard, whom you came to hear, does not now occupy this pulpit. A telegram a few hours ago brought to this town the information that he is detained at home by severe sickness. Though ill, he purposed to be with you and fulfil the important duty assigned to him in this day's proceedings. But the rapid progress of his indisposition now confines him to his sick chamber." After appealing to the candour of the congregation to receive with the necessary consideration and forbearance a sermon adapted for the occasion under singular disadvantages, the preacher took his text from 2 Chronicles ii. 4—6. The subject of the sermon was the Omnipresence of God, viewed both in its doctrinal and practical bearings, and dwelt upon especially as the reason and motive for devotion and public prayer. In conclusion, the preacher alluded to the special occasion, and referred to some interesting local

topics, paying a tribute of respect to the Congregational church, who had hitherto chiefly upheld the Nonconformity of Southampton, and whose present venerable pastor, Rev. Thomas Adkins, had filled a pastorate of nearly fifty years with good words and works. The preacher finished by a dedication of the new structure to its various solemn and affecting uses, and by an appeal to the generosity of those present to aid the effort of Mr. Kell and his people. The collection which followed was above £49; and when the amount was stated at a later part of the day's proceedings, it was made up to £50 by a kind lady from Royston. On quitting the church, we observed that there are not at present, what our readers will see in the engraving, iron palisades or railings. These must be a future work; but there are both in front and at the side of the church shrubs and plants, the gift of Mr. Aaron Guy, a kind friend residing at Ringwood.

About ninety persons, both ladies and gentlemen, and in nearly equal proportions, proceeded to the Victoria Rooms, where a substantial collation was prepared. The chair was taken and most ably filled throughout the day by Sir JOHN BOWRING, whose public services and character are held in deserved honour in Southampton. On the occasion of his departure for China, the Town Council presented to him an address and (if we remember aright) the freedom of the town. The proceedings began with the customary expression of loyalty. In proposing the toast of "The Queen,"

The CHAIRMAN said he was sure it would receive from them a most cordial welcome. It was that of the Sovereign of these realms. There never was a period in which the influence of England, its great specific influence, was so much felt, so widely spread, or so firmly established, as at this present moment. It is delightful to think that under the rule of a female Sovereign this country is exerting over the whole world a power friendly to the great interests of truth, of commerce, of progress and of liberty. In addition to the eminent merits and the thorough understanding which the Queen has shewn in respect to her political position, she has also given to them all an example of domestic excellence as a Wife and a Mother, so that while she had the greatest claim upon our patriotic feelings, she had no less a claim upon our social and domestic feelings.

The speech and toast were received with cheers.

Sir JOHN BOWRING then rose, and said he was going to introduce to their notice what might be considered pre-eminently the toast of the day. He hoped they would first allow him to express to them his own delight at the kind manifestation of feeling towards himself, in calling upon him to preside over them upon an occasion so interesting. He certainly came to Southampton that day with very mingled feelings. An old man gets his ideas and his thoughts so associated with gloomy and sad events, that he can scarcely fail to give expression to some of those thoughts which are uppermost in his mind; but he had come to the conclusion that the great changes which had taken place—changes especially produced by the removal of friends—were all manifestations of the working of Providence the most remarkable. And if he were asked to point out what, in the Divine government, demonstrated most the wisdom, the mercy, the kindness and foresight of the Almighty, he would say it was that dispensation by which generations were removed that, by their backwardness and distaste to improvement, stood in the way of wholesome changes, that they might be succeeded by generations more intelligent and more advanced, and which would go on in the march of improvement. They were now arrived at an era which they might call an era of progress and of improvement. Wherever they turned their eyes, they saw this great law of progress becoming mightier and mightier, influencing the political, commercial, religious and social condition of nations. They were moving forward, and onward, and upwards with constantly accelerated rapidity. He spoke of the progress of political liberty. What a comfort it was to live in days when, even in Italy, of which one of her poets had sadly sung that, "it was her destiny to be enslaved," hope had sprung up that now the dawn of freedom was awakening over that magnificent land! The people of England were, by a pacific policy, labouring most emphatically and undoubtedly for the accomplishment of that great result. Again, he looked at the progress of commercial emancipation. Nations were beginning to discover that it was not their interest to hate, but to love one another; not to injure, but to serve one another. When the earth was flung on the ecliptic, what was the great lesson designed to be taught? Why it was this—that each nation was gifted by the Divine Being with superfluities of some sort, which were to be taken in exchange for that which was superabundant in other nations. Other climates produced in abundance what our climate could not yield, and we were not to confine ourselves to the narrow limits of the portion of the globe which we inha-

bited. There was something which we had to give to others, and others had something to give us. He had seen the progress of this great thought. He saw that they were entering on a new era. He saw the prospect of a general and increasing prosperity. See how this spirit of free trade is working on society and influencing all existing institutions. He had lately furnished the Emperor of the French, at his request, with some of the moral statistics of the working of free trade, and from these it appeared that in 1852 there were, out of every 100,000 persons, 119 in gaol, and last year there were only 92 out of that number. The public morals had advanced at a ratio quite comforting to the philanthropist to contemplate. In the county of Somerset he was told lately that out of three gaols they were abandoning two. In Scotland it was his privilege to be in the house of a friend who was at the head of a department of government, and who told him that the office of gaoler was becoming a sinecure. He asked his friend the reason, and he told him that robbery was now a bad trade. Free trade had proved that honest industry was the working man's best policy. In the religious world, events like that which had assembled them together that day in Southampton, threw the light of sunshine upon their path. If the world were like a wilderness, which, thank God, it was not, the event of that day would be like an oasis, on which people would look with delight. He knew there were men who looked with despondency on the workings of God's providence, and desired the wheels of progress to revolve faster; but he thought there was no occasion for despondency. He saw a great and rapid growth on the earth of charity, and where he saw charity he saw truth. Truth and charity were twin sisters, living together in harmony and peace; and wherever these existed in any church, he felt assured that out of that element great virtue must necessarily accrue. He saw progress everywhere. There were religions that were called idolatrous; and if they exercised any great influence on the human race, he believed that influence was only to be attributed to the portion of truth that was in them. Did they think that the religion of Mahomet would have had the influence it possessed on the minds of the people of the East, had it not been associated with some truth, had it not been imbued with the elements of progress and some things better than that which it superseded? Mahometanism was a system better than the idolatry which the so-called *prophet of* Mecca found existing. He taught *distinctly the great* doctrine of the Unity of God. Buddhism was the religion of six millions of people. Great as might be the errors and deficiencies of that faith, there could be no doubt that it contained within it many elements of truth. When Confucius was consulted about the future, he said, "Of the future I know nothing. Talk to me of the past, I can tell you what history records; talk to me of what is before us now, I can tell you much; but talk to me of the future—there I stop—I know nothing." A few centuries afterwards, the Buddhists introduced themselves, and they professed to give that information which Confucius failed to give. They taught the doctrine of a future state of being. They also taught the important doctrine of the purity of human nature. They taught the purity and innocence of childhood. The first lesson taught in China is, The child is born pure, and if he become impure it is the fault of its parents or of society. Now it was because our Christian missionaries chose to begin their work by attacking this doctrine, so dear to every Chinese, that the missionaries made so little progress. Every mother resented the imputation made by those missionaries on the nature of her child. The Buddhists also taught the doctrine of universal redemption. They represented this world as in a period of transition. We are here for our merits or our defects, and we shall rise or sink according to our conduct. If a man's defects were greater than his merits, so much the longer would that man be in attaining happiness. They represented that all is tending towards ultimate good, and that in the end evil would be overcome and disappear. Many of their ideas were poetically beautiful; for instance, their ideas relating to the progress of time. They believe that there are moral and religious revolutions going on, separated by enormous distances. After millions of ages, other revolutions will come on. But the extent of time needed for the change could only be realised by supposing a drop of water to fall once in a hundred thousand years into a well, and that well three miles deep. Till by this process the well was filled, the change would not be fulfilled. They have another mode of representing this idea. They say that the revolution will be realised when a certain huge granite rock shall be worn away, and the process is only brought about by the visit of an angel, who once in a thousand years alights on it, and slightly grazes it by his wings, light as muslin. Whatever hold the Buddhist and other forms of faith had taken of the mind, was owing to the elements of truth involved in these religions. That element

might appear to us small. But looking at these facts, what encouragement ought they not to yield to those holding a purer faith and a religion of truth! We who have not a mere element of truth, but truth in such a majestic mass, why should we feel any distrust of our progress? We who have had such teachers, who have been receiving moral and intellectual contributions from all sides,—we who delight to throw open our opinions on every subject to be fearlessly discussed,—why should we fear that the cause of truth will fail? Truth is great—is greatest. We believe that the truths we hold are divine, and communicated from Heaven. We have received them a free and noble inheritance, and we were bound as freely to dispense them to others. One of the cheering marks of progress is such an event as that of this day. He saw with delight the gathering of so many friends, assembled from the north and the south to congratulate their friends of Southampton on the auspicious event of the day. All must have been delighted with the opportunity of offering up their devotions in the beautiful church opened that day. The Chairman concluded by proposing for their acceptance the sentiment—"Prosperity to the Unitarian Church, and our best wishes for the continued prosperity and spiritual advancement of the congregation of the Church of the Saviour, this day assembling for the first time in their new edifice."

Rev. EDMUND KELL, in acknowledging the sentiment, said he had the greatest satisfaction in meeting them on this the crowning effort of an attempt to establish Unitarianism in the town of Southampton. He was one who habitually cherished the cheerful views so beautifully expressed by their Chairman. He thought their cause stood on a good foundation, and it was only necessary to be in earnest to succeed. He was inclined to banish squint suspicion, and to trust that good fortune and zeal and energy would succeed. The sentiment of confidence in truth was happily progressing in their body. The spirit of missionary enterprize in which their congregation originated was acknowledged to be the right spirit. If in the North of England that spirit was more apparent, they might in the South point to the example of Southampton as a proof of what persevering exertion will do in removing great difficulties. There was a time, after four or five years experiment, when the prospect of success was so dark, that only one person desired its continuance. He had, as Secretary of the Southern Unitarian Association, received a document expressing this melancholy feeling. He mentioned it to no one at the time, but put it into the fire. He thought others would arise who would be more sanguine, or that his friends would see reason to change their views. They had persevered, and what the happy result was they saw that day—a beautiful church and an united and zealous congregation. His feelings had been greatly touched the previous evening by an offering of regard conveyed to him by a deputation of the congregation, an offering to which the humblest member of his flock had, he believed, added her mite. Mr. Kell, after a few other observations, concluded by offering to his friends the expression of his heartfelt gratitude for their aid, the assurance of his best efforts to promote their cause, and his cheerful trust that it would continue to advance and prosper.

At this stage of the proceedings, Rev. R. B. Aspland, as Secretary of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, introduced a deputation from the Society, consisting of Sir John Bowring, Rev. J. Panton Ham, Mr. Alfred Lawrence, Mr. E. Nettlefold and himself.

Mr. ALFRED LAWRENCE, after a few introductory observations, said that the deputation desired to offer to the pastor of the *Church of the Saviour* and his congregation their warm congratulations on the completion and opening of their beautiful church. They honoured the intrepid zeal with which, though few in numbers, the congregation had undertaken and carried successfully through this work. As in former efforts the members of the Unitarian Association felt it a duty and a pleasure to aid the Southampton congregation, the Committee had now authorized the deputation to convey to them a token of their cordial sympathy. It was his pleasant duty to read the resolution on the subject: "At a meeting of the Committee of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, held March 13, 1860, Charles Paget, Esq., M.P., in the chair, it was unanimously resolved, That the completion and approaching opening of a commodious and handsome Unitarian church in the important town of Southampton, is an event that calls for an expression of sympathy and congratulation from the members of this Committee. That although the Unitarian Association has on more than one previous occasion granted aid to the church of Southampton, this Committee feel called upon to attest their warm approval of the zeal and liberality of the pastor and his flock in their present undertaking, and that with a view of helping them, and encouraging others also to aid the good work, a further grant of Fifty Pounds be now made to the Building Fund,

and that this sum be sent by a Deputation from this Committee, consisting of Sir John Bowring, Rev. R. Brook Aspland, Rev. J. Panton Ham, Mr. Alfred Lawrence and Mr. Edward Nettlefold." The deputation desired him to add the expression of their warm admiration of the beautiful church which they had that day dedicated to the worship of the One True God, and to the preaching of the Gospel of the Saviour, of the high gratification which the proceedings of the day had given them, and of their hope that He who is the Giver of every good gift might crown their work with his enduring blessing.

Mr. Lawrence concluded by handing to Mr. Kell £50, also his own contribution of £5. 5s. Rev. J. Panton Ham presented £10 from Mr. John Watson, of London. Rev. R. B. Aspland read a congratulatory note from Mr. David Aspland Gibbs, and handed in a cheque for £5 from that gentleman. Mr. Nettlefold gave £5 from his father and £2 himself. Other contributions were also announced, and it was stated that towards the collection made in the church, Miss Edwards, of Portsmouth, had contributed £10, and Mr. H. A. Palmer, of Clifton, £5.

Mr. Edward Dixon said that, as one of the members of the Southampton congregation, it was his pleasant duty to acknowledge the liberal contribution of the Unitarian Association. Its amount in truth exceeded their most sanguine expectations, because they remembered the help given them on previous occasions by the Association, and they knew how numerous and urgent the claims on the Society were. In moving the cordial thanks of the meeting to the Association, he must say that the Southampton congregation felt highly honoured by the presence of such a deputation, composed of gentlemen of intelligence and zeal, some of whom were men of deservedly high reputation. The assemblage of friends that day was highly gratifying. The way in which their means had enlarged was surprising. To the labours and zeal of their worthy minister they felt that they were greatly indebted. He was one who looked always on the bright side of things. For his own part, he had sometimes been ready to despair; but when he saw Mr. Kell and observed his cheerful, hopeful face, his fears were removed. By the generosity of the friends to whom their minister had appealed, a considerable sum of money had been raised; but still a heavy debt would remain, for the liquidation of which they should have to ask further help. Their pastor was, he *rejoiced to know*, persuaded that the required amount would yet be raised. Mr. Dixon concluded by proposing, "Our cordial thanks to the British and Foreign Unitarian Association for the kind interest they have uniformly taken in the prosperity of the Unitarian church at Southampton, and for their liberal donation,—and a hearty welcome to the Deputation present on this occasion."

Dr. Watson, in seconding the resolution, said that the presence of such a deputation was more to them than the grant of money, liberal as it was.

Serjeant Spilsbury then moved, and Rev. R. Kell seconded, a resolution expressive of "thanks to those friends at a distance who had so generously aided the congregation in their efforts to raise a suitable temple for the worship of Almighty God."

Mr. Colfox, of Bridport, in acknowledging the vote of thanks, invited the friends present to attend the meeting of the Western Unitarian Christian Union shortly to be held in Bridport.

Rev. Henry Hawkes expressed his hope that the pastor of the Southampton church would visit Portsmouth, and that if he did he might obtain further aid from his flock. He begged leave not to congratulate them—that was needless—but to offer to his Southampton friends a practical valedictory observation. He would remind them that, beautiful as their external church was, it was built of stone, and stone is cold. It was their duty to warm it by their constant presence and hearty zeal. Let the living church gather together as if they were in earnest. Let them set aside needless hindrances. Let them not drop in by ones and twos. Their pastor had a heart; let them remember that if he rejoiced in their faithfulness, he must mourn when they were lukewarm or cold.

Here a break in the day's proceedings was proposed, and while the tea was prepared in the larger assembly-room, the visitors took the opportunity of walking through parts of this beautiful town. When they re-assembled in half an hour, the number of the guests was greatly increased, many of the inhabitants of the town coming in. Sir John Bowring resumed the chair, and, after a hymn had been spiritedly sung, proceeded to say that he was about to discharge a bounden obligation on their part, a pleasing duty on his. It was to thank the preacher for the very satisfactory manner in which he had discharged his part of the duties of the day,—for the able manner in which he had treated the grand subject which he had discussed in the admirable sermon preached in the morning. It was a simple fact that Christianity was at that

moment the only missionary, the only proselytising church in existence. There was a time, only three centuries after the appearance of their prophet, the Mahometans sent their missionaries to the end of the earth, and he himself had visited the tomb of the Mahometan missionaries in China who in these days of early zeal had been sent to convert the heathens in the extreme East. But at this time there is nothing like a Mahometan mission in China. The Buddhists also sent missionaries to China, and the Chinese returned the compliment by making a grand collection of Buddhist books. As many as twenty-two horses had traversed the country laden with Buddhist literature. In the 7th or 8th century, the Nestorians sent missionaries to China, and they had exercised a temporary influence, but now all traces of it had disappeared. Two centuries ago, the Jesuits entered China and constructed a mission on a large scale. For a time they wielded considerable power, converting several members of the royal court, and gaining many converts among the people. He had visited a Chinese village in which were 3000 native Catholic Christians. At last, by their want of prudence and their antagonism to the opinions and usages of the people of the country, the Jesuits were driven away from China. There were now openings in China for Christian effort, and the missionaries sent there were producing a certain amount of good. He wished they had a little less of orthodoxy and a little more of Unitarianism, and then he believed that their labours would be more successful. It is not possible for orthodox missionaries to make satisfactory progress until they modify some of their doctrines. They cannot make any great way in China, if the child is represented as corrupt, and by its very nature condemned to perdition before it has committed a single fault. Their doctrine of the corruption of human nature was the great difficulty that hindered their progress in China. He knew a case in which a missionary went to a Chinaman of high character and talked to him of his individual sins, and told him that unless he and his countrymen received the gospel, they would be damned. The answer of the Chinaman was, "You are surely under some strange mistake. You must be thinking of some one else. I never told a lie. I live an upright life. Ask my neighbours what I am. If your religion compels you to tell me that I am a very wicked man, why should I receive it?—for I know it says that which is not true. Do you mean to say that my ancestors also will be damned for not believing what they were never taught, and that they were wicked people? If so, let me tell you that your religion is as uncourteous as it is unjust." If, indeed, the more intelligent natives of the East could hear teachings like those of his friend at his side, teachings comprehensive, founded on just reasoning, liberal in spirit and giving utterance to no denunciations, he should entertain a better hope of missionary labours. After some further remarks on the Chinese notions of religion, especially on their view of punishment as altogether remedial, the Chairman turned to the other side of the question, and spoke of the deficiencies of the Buddhist faith. While Christianity was the faith of 200 millions, Buddhism was the faith of 600 millions. But he could not but compare and contrast what he had seen in these heathen countries with what he saw at home. In China he found the record of an advanced civilization more than a thousand years ago. He looked into the annals of his own country then, and found England sunk in barbarism. From that day to this China has continued to exist without improvement. Indeed it was probable that for forty-five centuries China had remained almost stationary. In England he saw everywhere signs of progress. In every rank of life, every man in this country knew that he had duties to perform, and was considering how he might best fulfil them. Children were taught to strive to be better and wiser than their parents. Everything that tended to make men wiser and better helped to make them more divine. Therefore it was that he looked with satisfaction on events like that which had that day gathered so many friends of truth together. When utterance was given to sublime doctrines like those they had heard in the morning, which set forth the character of God, it could not but tend to exalt the character of men, the sons of God. Doctrines like those must infallibly make their way. There was a vast deal of truth working its way. He knew, indeed, how much concealment there was of honest conviction, how many men there were who would run no risks, who would not utter unpalatable truth, lest they should be looked upon with distrust in the social circle. But there was still the golden vein of truth, and, however concealed for a time, the gold remained and in the end it would be turned to account. What gold is to the barren rock, that truth is to the human intellect. To no class of men did they owe a greater debt of gratitude than to those who, like his reverend friend, from their faithful studies, their thoughtfulness and their honest avowal of convictions, were opening out rich strata, full of the

priceless ore of truth. The Chairman concluded by proposing a vote of thanks to Rev. R. Brook Aspland for his able and highly appropriate dedicatory discourse.

Rev. R. B. Aspland, in acknowledging the vote, dwelt on the importance of a free and able utterance of Unitarian truth wherever Protestant Nonconformity existed. Unitarianism was only consistent Protestantism. The tendency towards the principles of Unitarianism, wherever the Reformation was a reality and not a name, had been long ago pointed out by Bossuet. The speaker illustrated this fact in some detail by references to ecclesiastical history and to the known opinions of many eminent men in orthodox churches who had at this point or that forsaken orthodoxy and reached forward to Unitarian truth. He appealed to orthodox Dissenters of Southampton not to be troubled by the appearance in their midst of the new faith, but to give it a candid reception as the proper complement of religious truth. They might be assured that Unitarianism was not an intellectual or spiritual disease to be purged from the constitution of society by drastic remedies, but the inevitable result of the growth and development of principles with which the moral welfare and the continued progress of men were inseparably bound up. But our exhausted space prevents our giving more than an outline of this speech and of all that followed.

Rev. J. Panton Ham, being called upon by the Chairman, spoke excellently on the subject of Missionary effort and the Unitarian Church. In conclusion, he expressed his deep interest in the Southampton Unitarian church, his admiration at what they had already effected, and his desire to see them at the earliest possible period relieved from the burthen of debt. To assist in this desirable consummation, he offered to be one of ten, if the other nine could be found, who would pledge themselves during the coming year to raise each £50. But as his challenge and proposition of extinguishing the debt by this mode was not accepted, he would promise to apply the sum of £100 at no very distant period towards the extinction of the debt. He did not offer this out of his private resources, for he was not a rich man, but from a fund recently left by the bequest of a gentleman in India for the promotion of Unitarian Christianity.

Rev. Richard Shelley spoke ably on the subject of Education, and especially religious education, and trusted that the new church would have its Sunday-school, arguing that, of all classes of Christians, Unitarians were bound to promote education.

Dr. Longstaff, of London, in an interesting speech proposed a vote of thanks to the architect, Mr. Philip Brannon, to whom the design and construction of that beautiful church had been a labour of love, to which he had devoted his professional talents and his personal superintendence with an energy and a forgetfulness of his individual interests that entitled him to the warm expression of their gratitude.

Rev. R. Kell seconded the resolution, offering a high eulogium on the merits, professional and otherwise, of the architect.

Mr. Philip Brannon, in acknowledging the vote, spoke of the principles of his art, and their adaptation to a religious structure.

On a resolution being passed, thanking the visitors for their sympathy and help, Mr. Blundell, of Hull, acknowledged the vote, and said how much he desired to see such a church in the possession of the Unitarians in his own town. In conclusion, he took up the challenge of Mr. Ham, and offered in the course of two years to provide £50 towards the extinction of the debt, provided the other portions of it were extinguished.

Rev. Henry Howes was called up by an expression of interest in the infant Unitarian church of Reading.

A vote of acknowledgment was made to Mr. Chinnock for his services as contractor.

On the motion of Rev. R. B. Aspland, seconded by Rev. E. Kell, a vote was taken expressing the sympathy of the meeting with the Rev. Dr. Beard in his illness, regret at his absence, and warm approbation of his varied services to the Unitarian cause.

Mr. Williams, of Tunbridge Wells, then moved a vote of thanks to the distinguished Chairman, whose eloquent addresses had given them equal delight and instruction. The resolution was seconded by Rev. M. Rowntree, and adopted by the meeting with tokens of enthusiastic approbation, every one rising, and then a general cheer breaking forth in all parts of the room.

In acknowledging the vote, Sir John Bowring said that his life had been of great vicissitude and anxiety. In his age, after having been flung upon the wide waters of the world, he returned to his native country, in which it was his desire to find his grave. He had ever had abundant cause to rejoice in the opinions of his religious faith. His attachment to them had grown with his growth. His religious opinions were very dear to him, and they grew dearer as he grew older. There were many circumstances connected with absence which fill the mind with gloom.

Returning to their country, they are met everywhere by the shadows of the dead. There was not a place he could visit in which he did not find blanks which memory alone could fill. But he was consoled by the signs of progress he everywhere beheld. If he had been privileged to state great truths—the result of earnest thought and study—to have early adopted opinions before his age—he was grateful for it. He had many sources of pleasure in looking back, and he could also look forward with hope and trust. Every man should look forward, and do what he can to make the world wiser and better than he found it.

Thus was brought to a conclusion one of the most spirited and well-sustained meetings which we have had the pleasure of late to attend. If to mere visitors the events of the day were full of interest, how profoundly interesting must they have proved to the excellent minister and to the skilful architect by whose zealous labours the scheme of the new church was devised and so successfully carried out!

The sermons on Sunday, March 25th, were preached to large and increasing congregations by Rev. J. Panton Ham. The subject chosen for the morning discourse was, "The Aspirations and Aims of the Christian Ministry;" and the text, Ephes. iv. 13.

"On a subject of such high concern as religion," he observed, "involving interests and obligations which all reflecting persons admit to be paramount, nothing can be more unsatisfactory and prejudicial than vagueness of apprehension and the sense of uncertainty and indecision necessarily associated with it. It is an essential condition of religious peace and activity—that is, well-directed activity—that the soul have convictions; that no dark cloud of doubt envelop the mind in reference to religious truth and duty; that the soul shall be able with intelligent confidence to say to itself, 'I know whom and what I believe.' Without this confidence there can be no foundation of inward peace,—no holy impulses to animate and sustain the religious life,—no sufficient motive to Christian diligence and service. It is reasonable to assume that it is not the tendency of true religion to engender a state of mental doubt and uncertainty, and that the existence of such doubt and uncertainty is always to be explained by a reference to some other cause than the direct influence of religion itself. It may be due to a want of simplicity or diligence, or to a peculiarity of mental constitution, which cannot rest in its attainments, but must be always questioning and unsettling even first principles. It may be due to intellectual fastidiousness or pride, which regards whatever is final and stationary as the mark of mental imbecility,—an acknowledgment that the intellect has found a limit, not heeding the possibility that it may have found a fact or principle which is necessarily final and stationary as a part of the immovable foundation upon which a superstructure of truth can alone be built. It may be due to an erroneous conception of progress, which accepts nothing as fundamental, which never builds up, but is always digging up old and laying down new principles. Whencesoever this life of doubt may take its rise, it is safe to say that religion is not its inspiration and excuse. The religion of Jesus Christ, as taught and exemplified by himself and its earliest promulgators, is sufficiently clear and definite to enable impartiality and ordinary intelligence to say what it is. The Christian religion is the character and life of Christ. He himself so expresses it. '*I* am the way, the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father but by me.' The personal Christ is the summary of the Christian faith. If we have a distinct record of his character and life in the New Testament,—if there be no difficulty in saying what were his spirit and principles—if it be still possible, as Jesus said, 'I am come a Light into the World,' to say, what that 'Light' is, then surely is it possible to say what is the Christian religion, and what the elements of that holy culture in which all are to be instructed, and by which all are to be inspired in order to be truly Christian and partake of the Christian salvation. Our text presumes on this possibility, and therefore rebukes everything like doubt and instability in the Christian profession."

The preacher then proceeded to consider the claims of the apostle that all Christians should "come into *the unity of the knowledge* of the Son of God," which, it was argued, was quite consistent with the claims and necessities of the individual understanding. He vindicated the apostle from the surmise that he betrays an ignorance of the mental constitution of mankind, and of the purpose and tendency of the religion which he was elected to teach, in supposing that Christian people should all *think* alike on the Christian rudiments, and should all *speak* the same thing. He shewed that he can only be so charged on the assumption that such a thing as *positive* truth in Christianity is an illusion, that all truth is merely approximative, and that it is never possible to say such and such is *truth*. This assumption it was

urged was disallowed by the emphatic assertion of Christ, "I am the Truth."

"All men," the preacher said, "are at one in their conceptions of the Christ as a moral and religious phenomenon to the world. There are no two opinions about the spirit by which he was actuated, the moral characteristics and tendencies of the life he lived. Already we all think the same thing and speak the same thing about the person Jesus. He is to all Christians the image of highest excellence,—the normal humanity,—the reflection in a human life of all that is perfect and divine,—'the image,' as Paul asserts, 'of the invisible God.' Here then is the *absolute* in religion and morality seen and confessed by all. Thus far there is 'a unity of the *knowledge* of the Son of God.' Did we all pause here there would be no diversity. And why should we not all pause here? Is not this the *whole* of the manifestation of the Christ as 'the Truth'? All beyond is speculative and non-essential; interesting, it may be, to human curiosity, but extra-religious, and therefore of no authority and of inferior practical worth. There remains a great service to be done for Christianity, and this is, to point out distinctly the essential, and define its limits; to separate the chaff from the wheat; to draw broadly the line which shall distinguish between 'the doubtful disputations' of ingenious men, and the absolute, everlasting truth of the doctrine of Christ. In so far as we succeed in doing this shall we promote the aspiration of all good men expressed by the apostle in our text, that we may 'all come to the unity of the knowledge and the unity of the faith of the Son of God.'"

On the apostolic exhortation to the attainment of unity of *faith*, it was observed: "Both discipleship and salvation are contingent on the possession of the spirit and principles of Jesus Christ, which are only to be acquired through the agency of faith. Until the soul be persuaded of the truth and moral beauty of the spirit and principles of Christ, and incited to embrace them, it cannot even enter the school of Christ, but must of necessity—the necessity of its moral constitution—stand apart from it, a stranger to its culture and discipline; and this persuasion and incitement are the action of faith. We step now on the higher ground of *religion*, properly so called. 'Leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ' as settled and accepted, we are now prepared to go on in the practical course of religious life 'unto perfection.' And here is all the difficulty—the arena of moral conflicts—the sphere of moral heroism—the higher, the highest 'unity' to which as Christian disciples it is possible and inevitable to attain. This unity it is the grand aim of the Christian ministry to promote. All ministerial instruction and exhortation must tend towards this as its supreme anxiety and ultimate object. Till 'the unity of the *faith* of the Son of God' be reached, the ministry of Christian truth and righteousness is unfulfilled. This is our travail—our holy, divine labour. In so far as we are successful in promoting this godly unity, the seal of God is on our work, and we have our reward."

The preacher then proceeded to expound the lofty aspiration of the Christian ministry as expressed in the language and life of St. Paul—the duty of going on unto perfection—the coming unto a perfect man, the fulness of the measure of the stature of Christ; and after disclaiming for the professional pulpit any monopoly of ministerial functions, which it was maintained were shared by the whole "church of the Saviour," as members of "the royal priesthood" ordained by the High Priest of our profession himself, concluded with several practical suggestions, and the expression of many cordial wishes that that section of the church of the Saviour in Southampton might illustrate the spirit and principles of the text, and contribute to the great educational work which the church on earth was established to advance.

Our space will not permit us to give any extract from the discourse in the evening, which was on the Kingship of Christ and the Characteristics of his Kingdom.

Collections were made after each service, amounting to about £10.

THE CHURCH OF THE SAVIOUR, SOUTHAMPTON.

This elegant structure has been erected in Bellevue Place. It is exceedingly neat and commodious, and the style of the architecture has drawn forth great admiration from those who have inspected the building. Its plan, construction and details, have been specially designed and carefully carried out with a view to shew that the greatest economy in contrivance and execution are in the highest degree consistent with strength, solidity and durability, rigid architectural propriety, and the most elegant decorative expression. That these objects have been attained in no small measure, seems evident from the unequivocal testimony of every one acquainted with such matters, that whilst no building of the kind has been in modern times more solidly built, and although there are over 300 symbolical carvings, it

is without a question the "cheapest church in Great Britain."

The seats are arranged for the present to accommodate 300 worshipers, but the whole church can at any time be thrown open and seat 500. Until there shall be separate school-rooms built, the gallery and the space below will be occupied as such, and for committee-rooms and library. The warming is on a double system, and has been very creditably carried out by the Messrs. Lankester. All the other contracts have been taken by Mr. G. William Chinnock, who has executed his work most admirably.

In the construction, the concrete was laid in a peculiar manner, and the walls have been grouted with quick lias lime grout throughout. Shirley grit and blue lias lime were used for the mortar; and the architect, in order to shew the building resources of the district, has employed not only a large quantity of the best Swanage and Portland, and of the very best of the Bath oolites, but has introduced, for the first time in Southampton, the admirable fire stone, Purbecks and Portland of Wilts and Somerset.

The interior of the church is 70 feet long, by 32 wide. It is open timber-roofed, and has vestries and offices on the south side, under a low lean-to roof. It consists of five bays, each having a triplet window, alternately with the three lights equal and the side ones lower. Externally the buttresses are carried above the sculptured corbel table in gable, canopied and weathered heads, very agreeably breaking the line of roof. The east end has a rose window, composed on the basis of a cross and star united, and the west or entrance front has a magnificent septet, the two side arches of which are treated as panels, to avoid excess of light. The only gallery is at this end.

Interiorly, the roof is carried by arched principals, so effectually and yet economically dovetail-scarfed as to possess extraordinary strength, although having no other transverse tie except a very short collar over the arch point. Each principal springs by a deep wall-post from corbels and shafts which connect it with the footing of the wall. The roof has also several important features of considerable novelty, so as to preserve an equable temperature and protect the timbers from the action of damp and alternations of heat and cold.

The greatest attention has been paid to the acoustic arrangements, so as to prevent the rolling of sound in the open roof, and all echo or excess of resonance, and at the same time so to strengthen and concentrate the volume of the preacher's voice, and so direct it to the auditory, as to render the weakest voice distinctly audible; and it was highly satisfactory to find at the opening services, although the arrangements alluded to are not yet completely carried out, every portion of the addresses was heard with the greatest distinctness. There is a novel arrangement in the front of the pulpit for the deaf, and in addition to the appliances for the conducting of sound to the deaf worshipers, the book-board itself is constructed on the principles obvious in the external ear, so as to collect and convey the sound into the sound chamber; and the pulpit canopy, or sounding-board, is contrived with a special view to intensify the power of the preacher's voice.

In the design of the edifice, as far as the small funds at the disposal and the limited size of the building admitted, the architect has endeavoured to give an example of true architectural design, in which every part will have been reasoned out of the necessities, uses and constructional properties of the building, in opposition to the prevalent system of *typist composition*, in which every part is more or less the direct and unmistakeable copy of some example or pattern—in fact, the positive plagiarism of another author's thoughts and sentiments as expressed in stone. His conviction was—and the building appears to be a triumphant justification of its correctness—that not only will original design be fresher and more gratifying to the public, but that it is indispensable if sound scientific construction, permanence and stability, are to be secured at moderate cost.

The style adopted is the first Pointed English (early English), but worked out, as above intimated, by its principles, and not by the copying of its precedents. Hence the windows, which are necessarily lancet or trefoil heads, are set to new proportions and in a novel disposition, so that whilst the too frequent monotony of such openings is avoided, the full balance of effect, which is the great end of genuine design, is nevertheless fully secured. The whole of the details have been dealt with on the same method, and the architect personally prepared the drawings or moulds to the full size for all mouldings, decorative expressions, or of important constructional points in carpentry, masonry and smiths' work.

The object sought by the architect in this structure was by no means to make a display of originality, or in any way to serve a secondary or unworthy object. His whole study has been, in setting out the proportions, and in arranging, designing and finishing the details, to produce, as far as pecuniary means admitted, a building

that should be conducive to that solemnity of feeling indispensable for the worship of the Most High, and that should be suggestive of holy reflections, and recall the great truths and actors of our religion to the thoughts of the beholder. To advance these ends, he has objected to any mere conventional decorations, but has confined the decorative expression to the conversion of all the necessary salient corbellings and capitals into carvings, which he has in every case designed with a special signification in relation to the great truths of the Christian religion. Not only has each its direct expression, but on each side, exteriorly and interiorly, they are placed in separate series complete in themselves. The symbolic expression is chiefly derived from the natural qualities of plants and animals, and only conventional when thoroughly Catholic, and not specially Papistic or Puseyite. On the east, the references are to the Redeemer, as the Sun of Righteousness arising with healing on his wings, and the bright and morning star. On the north, the trials and temptations of life are symbolised, with the effects of the experience of the Cross in the heart of the believer. On the west are references to death and the promises of a future life; and on the south, the triumphs of the church and its extension over the world. In the tympanum over the west door is an alto-relief of the Sermon on the Mount; and in the interior, the north side contains in the capitals, shaft corbels, and angel brackets below, and in the Hanmer beams of the principals, emblems of the Adamic, Noahchic, Mosaic and Prophetic ages of the pre-Christian church. In the east end are the emblems of the apostles and evangelists, and the sufferings of our Saviour; and on the south side the emblems are of the Church's revelation of eternal life, and of the martyr, teaching, triumphant and glorified states of Christ's church on earth and in heaven.

The stone carvings were executed by Mr. Robert Charles Baker, assisted by Messrs. Grasby and Abbey, and in several instances finished by the hand of the architect himself. Those in wood were the work of Messrs. Elmes, of Southampton.

EAST LANCASHIRE UNITARIAN MISSION — ORDINATION OF REV. W. ROBINSON.

On Thursday, March 15th, a religious service was held in the Mechanics' Institution, Burnley, in connection with the ordination of the Rev. Wm. Robinson, who has just completed his studies at the College of the Home Missionary Board. Mr. Robinson has been appointed to the office of Missionary to the East Lancashire Association, and he is to labour in connection with the recently formed congregations at Burnley and Accrington, and to open a place in the great manufacturing town of Blackburn.

Upwards of two hundred persons were present during the service, which took place at three o'clock in the afternoon. It was very gratifying to observe that the great majority of the hearers were of the working classes, who had left their mills and shops to shew their interest in celebrating the settlement of a minister amongst them. Friends from Bury, Bolton, Preston, Newchurch, Padiham, Ainsworth, Manchester, Rawtenstall, &c., were present. Among the ministers were the Revds. F. Baker, John Wright, L. Taplin, W. C. Squier, J. C. Street, G. Hoade, A. Rankton, F. Macdonald, and all the students of the Home Missionary Board.

Rev. G. Hoade, of Newchurch, conducted the devotional service in an appropriate and interesting manner. The Rev. F. Baker then addressed Mr. Robinson and heartily welcomed him amongst the ministers of the district. He spoke from the words, "Go thou and preach the kingdom of God" (Luke ix. 60). He went on to say that there were many large and important districts where Unitarianism was quite unknown. This might seem strange considering the simplicity of our doctrines. Orthodoxy in almost any form was freely accepted; but Unitarianism attracted odium and was certainly not the path to popularity. He had no doubt that Mr. Robinson had spent solemn seasons in preparing himself for his work, and would now enter upon it with self-denial and zeal. During late years, a missionary spirit had manifested itself amongst us. Certain plans of action had been adopted, and the two counties of Lancaster and Chester had been divided into districts. As minister of the East Lancashire district, it would be Mr. Robinson's duty to labour within its boundaries. He could not believe that our doctrines could be preached in that district without success, when he remembered that we taught the Fatherhood of God, and that His love extended to all men. This ought to be sufficient to attract the attention of thoughtful people. The fact of our having so much in common with orthodox Christians should enable us to work even upon them. It would be the duty of the young minister to give simple doctrines instead of mysterious ones, and offer the consolations of religion in their plainest forms. It would be for him to teach men that there is something beyond this life; to draw them to something better

than they can enjoy here; to point out to them that in religious feeling, and conviction, and habits, and the public and private worship of God, there is an enjoyment which cannot otherwise be obtained here, and which is also the best preparation for the existence and growth of happiness hereafter. Though, as the tree falls so it lies,—though the sinner is not prepared on entering the future world to take the place awarded to him who had led a life of prayer, yet it is our belief and teaching that God can never have created any soul to destroy it; that by some means, inscrutable to us, God will eventually bring all to happiness. It would be the office of the minister to preach these truths. He should keep constantly before his hearers that they are accountable to God for all their actions. He should cultivate among them a prayerful spirit, and teach them to love Jesus Christ as their elder brother, whom God had sent to lead men to righteousness. He should carefully read and familiarly explain the Scriptures to his people, and go among them from house to house. Mr. Baker concluded by praying God to bless the young minister and his labours.

Rev. W. Robinson then in a brief but impressive speech responded.

After a hymn had been sung, the Rev. John Wright rose to address the representatives of the congregations. He said that there were two circumstances which marked Mr. Robinson's position as peculiar: first, he was to minister, not to one, but to three congregations; second, that these congregations had not hitherto had a minister, but had depended on the services of a number of preachers. Under these circumstances, it was quite possible that too much might be expected from him. A man who had to attend to three congregations could not, of course, devote as much time to each as if he had only one. The minister came among them, not to put a stop to their labour, but to help them to work more courageously and with a clearer view of what they had to do. The reason why there should be Unitarian congregations here was a plain one. Some might say that there were churches and chapels enough in all these towns—would not those suffice? But the worship usually offered in the great majority of those places was such as no Unitarian could join in. They might do it occasionally in single services, but not as a general rule. Besides, the members of orthodox churches would not have us among them unless we parted with our freedom and signed creeds which we did not believe. Therefore we deemed it our duty to God to form separate congregations wherever we find a few persons who profess the principles which lie at the basis of our organization and are willing to spread them. Our fundamental principles were few and simple. We believed in One God, our Father, a God of love. We believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, our elder brother and true exemplar; in man as inclined to good as well as evil, and free to choose his own part, and dependent on himself for his welfare under the providence of God. We believed in salvation, not as an arbitrary gift, given to some and denied to others, but as a thing which every man could gain for himself if he would exercise his powers and seek the spirit of God. Holding these glorious truths, we felt impelled, as before God, to profess them boldly and teach them publicly, that others may partake of our blessings, and not to rest from our labours till they be acknowledged by the world. These principles we held, not at the bidding of any man, not on account of educational prejudice or association, but because we believed that Christ and his apostles taught them, because our reason responded to and accorded with them, because the natural feelings of the human heart were satisfied with them, because our experience told us that they are good to live by and safe to die by. He brought these things forward because the Unitarians of the neighbourhood were, in their several districts, the depositaries of God's truth. Though they might be few, and not many rich or great among them, yet zeal and good principles are in themselves riches and power and strength more than this world can give. The question of success was entirely in their own hands. If they were earnest and worked with zeal, their labour would not be in vain. It depended on them in a great measure what their minister would be. If they worked with him, God would bless their efforts.

Rev. L. Taplin then gave out a hymn, and concluded the interesting service with a most appropriate prayer.

In the evening, a tea-meeting was held in the same place. After tea, addresses were delivered by the Revds. F. Baker (who presided), J. Wright, L. Taplin, G. Hoade, J. T. Whitehead, W. Robinson, J. C. Street, A. Rushton, Messrs. M'Master, Mitchell and Glover, of the Home Missionary Board, and Messrs. Holland and Wilkinson. The proceedings terminated about ten o'clock.

From the *Bury Unitarian Circular* we take the following:

"The East Lancashire Unitarian Mission is now completely formed and at work.

There are enrolled as belonging to it eleven congregations and five mission stations in this district, and there is reason to hope that some other congregations will ere long annex themselves. The Committee meets quarterly, and has appointed a district missionary, the Rev. William Robinson, late a student at the Unitarian Home Missionary Board. Mr. Robinson will reside at Accrington, and will labour in that town and in the neighbouring localities of Blackburn and Burnley. At Blackburn, arrangements have been made for opening a room for Unitarian preaching on March 11th. Some resident Unitarians have taken up the matter, and there is reason to hope for a fair opening for the establishment of a mission station which may in time grow into a congregation.

"While the above facts shew that the Committee of the mission are doing what in them lies to carry out its objects, it must be remembered that they require the support of all the members of all our congregations, both in personal exertions and in pecuniary contributions. Collections in the chapels have already been made in Todmordon, Bury and Park Lane, and subscriptions are being got in in Bolton and other places. But unless we have the general help of all the Unitarians of the district, each congregation doing its utmost according to its means, we cannot succeed."

MANCHESTER UNITARIAN SUNDAY-SCHOOL UNION.

The first annual meeting of the Manchester Unitarian Sunday-School Union was held at the Lower Mosley-Street schools on Monday, March 5th, the Rev. E. W. Hopkinson, President, in the chair, who opened the business of the evening by calling on the Secretary (Mr. G. Payne) to read the report, of which the following is a summary. For about ten years previous to the establishment of the Union, the teachers of the Sunday-schools in Manchester had held monthly meetings for friendly intercourse and the discussion of subjects bearing on the work of Sunday-school instruction; but it was thought, owing to the success which attended the delivery of a course of lectures by the Rev. T. E. Poynting (provided by the District Sunday-School Association), that the Manchester teachers might provide themselves with lectures, and do generally for the schools of that city what the District Association aims to do for those of the district. On this basis the Sunday-School Union was formed, not to supersede, but rather to act as an auxiliary to the District Association. It was also resolved to continue the Sunday afternoon monthly meetings, which have been uniformly well attended, and at which papers have been read on a variety of interesting topics by the following gentlemen: Mr. Councillor Rawson, Rev. Joseph Freestone, Dr. Marcus, Dr. Alcock, Messrs. R. Pilcher, Glossop, Benson and others. During the summer, the Committee made arrangements for a series of Saturday-afternoon excursions, which proved a delightful means of promoting a kindly intercourse among the members, with a view of assisting the teachers, especially the younger ones. Several pamphlets bearing on the art of Teaching have been distributed among the members, also handbills on parental co-operation for distribution amongst the families connected with the schools.

Rev. Dr. Beard has kindly conducted a class during the months of October, November and December, 1859, for religious improvement; but as the attendance did not continue satisfactory, Dr. Beard felt that other claims had precedence, and declined to continue his instructions. The Committee regret this exceedingly, as they looked upon the class as an important auxiliary, and one much needed by the teachers.

In conclusion, the Committee have great reason to be satisfied with the results of the past year's labours, and feel confident that future exertions will be rewarded with equal, if not with increased success. The Treasurer's report was then read, and shewed a small balance in favour of the Union.

The Chairman then moved that the report be adopted, which was seconded by Mr. F. Holme and carried unanimously.

Rev. J. C. Street moved, That the best thanks of the meeting be presented to the Committee and to the various officers for their services during the past year, and read a list of names proposed as a Committee for the next year, Dr. Beard accepting the office of President,—which was seconded by Mr. R. Wade and carried unanimously.

On the motion of Mr. Lowe, seconded by Rev. James Drummond, it was resolved,

"That this meeting presents its best thanks to the Rev. Dr. Beard for his kindness in conducting the religious improvement class, and at the same time desires to express its deep regret that he finds himself compelled to discontinue it."—The proceedings were varied by numerous recitations, glees, &c.

A vote of thanks to those who had so kindly given their services for the entertainment of the meeting, followed by a similar vote to the Chairman, closed the proceedings at about ten o'clock.

MOSSLEY UNITARIAN CHAPEL AND SCHOOL.

We beg to call the attention of our readers to the advertisement and appeal of the Mossley Unitarians. The history of that church is a most interesting illustration of what can be done by faithful and earnest missionary labour. We have a long report of the proceedings of the meeting at which the effort for the extinction of the debt began and was carried on to the removal of half the burthen. We shall endeavour to find room for the report in our next No. In the mean time we cordially recommend the case to the immediate help of our Unitarian friends.

STAND.

On the evening of February 5th, the teachers held their quarterly meeting. Elder scholars and friends contributed to comfortably fill the room to the number of 120. An essay was read by Mr. W. Bass (one of the Sunday-school teachers) on the "Popular Ways of Killing Time, by Smoking, Drinking, &c.,"—subjects which all who desire the good of their fellow-men will do well to take in hand, with a view to reformation and prevention. The pleasantest part of the evening's business was the presentation of a beautiful silver watch (value £5. 10*s.*) to the superintendent. It bore this inscription: "A token of esteem from the Teachers and Scholars of Stand Sunday-school, to Mr. Ormerod, Feb. 1860." After rendering hearty votes of thanks to the essayist, the ladies and the Chairman (Rev. J. Cropper, M.A.), the meeting was closed with praise and prayer.

OBITUARY.

March 3, at Bowden, Cheshire, aged 72 years, JOHN BUTLER TOULMIN, Esq., late of Mobile, Alabama, United States.

He was the youngest son of the late Rev. Joshua Toulmin, D.D., of Birmingham, and was born at Taunton, where his father was for nearly 39 years the highly respected pastor of a society of Unitarian General Baptists, and whence he removed to Birmingham, in the year 1804, in order to become one of the pastors of the New Meeting-house, in conjunction with the late Rev. John Kentish. After being engaged for some years in business in Birmingham, Mr. Toulmin emigrated to the United States, whither his two brothers had preceded him, and where one of them had attained the high office of Judge in one of the Southern States. Here he engaged in the business of a Commission Merchant, in which, after repeated reverses, which he bore with exemplary patience and repaired with persevering energy, he was at last eminently successful, and in the prosecution of which he kept up such frequent personal intercourse with his native land, that he crossed the Atlantic more than thirty times. Here, too, he became intimately acquainted with many of our most celebrated divines; himself ever consistently avowing and maintaining his sentiments as a Unitarian Christian, and contributing liberally to the support of Unitarian Christian worship. He had finally fixed his residence on a beautiful estate which he had purchased in the neighbourhood of Mobile; and leaving there some members of his family, had returned with his wife to this country, for the last time, in the early part of last year. After residing in Edgbaston, near Birmingham, during the summer and autumn, resuming his connection, as on a former occasion, with the religious society of which his venerable father had been the honoured minister, and in whose welfare he himself ever took a lively interest, he had gone to pass the winter at Bowden, in the hope of returning in the spring to Edgbaston, again to take up his abode, for a season at least, in the midst of the relatives and friends by whom he was there surrounded, and who would have rejoiced to welcome him back. But this hope was doomed to the severest disappointment. Early in the present year he was attacked by a disorder to which he had been frequently subject; and after very acute and protracted sufferings, which he bore with exemplary patience, he yielded up his breath in cheerful reliance on that Divine goodness and mercy which he thankfully owned had followed him all the days of his life. His remains were conveyed from Bowden to Birmingham, attended by some of his most intimate personal friends, and were there interred in the General Cemetery at Hockley, the last sad rites being conducted by his friend and pastor, the Rev. Samuel Bache.

Mr. Toulmin was eminently an upright, practical, warm-hearted, generous man. Thankful to God for the success which had crowned his labours, he regarded his wealth as a trust and used it accordingly; being ever ready to assist those who were in need of his aid, and rejoicing "to do good and to communicate" as he could find opportunity. His cheerful pleasantry, his kind

and genial hospitality, his unostentatious benevolence, endeared him to a large circle of relatives and friends, by whom, both in his native country and in the country of his adoption, his memory will be long and affectionately cherished. B. B.

March 10, at her mother's house, Sheffield, of consumption, after a long illness, aged 21, CATHERINE HUTTON, second daughter of the late Rev. T. B. STANNUS.

March 16, at Ernecroft, Compstall, Cheshire, in her 44th year, ELLEN, wife of George ANDREW, Esq.

March 16, at Lenton Abbey, near Nottingham, ANNE, widow of the late Isaac FISHER, Esq., in the 82nd year of her age.

March 17, Mrs. JAMESON, widow of the late Hon. Robert Simpson Jameson, Vice-Chancellor of the Canadas, in her 66th year, admired and loved, as she is most deeply lamented. The following tribute is from the pen of the London correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*:

"The death of Mrs. Jameson is a great loss to the literature of the arts, but a greater still to the many friends of this most exemplary, intelligent and genial lady. Few of the public knew under what circumstances Mrs. Jameson's works were produced—at what cost of ill-remunerated but most conscientious labour—and on what holy and self-sacrificing purposes the proceeds of that labour were employed. For many, many years, Mrs. Jameson was the almost sole support of her mother and her sisters, and of a sister's child besides. No one ever bore a heavier load of self-imposed obligations, or carried that load more uncomplainingly. She moved under it as if she never felt it. But it was very heavy for all that, and it has broken her down at last. Her almost incessant labour during the latter years of her life, was lightened by an annuity of £100 (in addition to a pension of the same amount), which annuity she owed to the determined kindness of her friend, Mrs. Procter (wife of that sweetest of singers and kindliest of men, better known to the world by his *nom de plume* of Barry Cornwall), who raised the sum required for the purchase of this annuity, by her own unaided efforts, from among Mrs. Jameson's friends, and presented it to the unsuspecting and astonished donee as a birthday gift. It is well that such acts should be known, especially when done so unostentatiously and bravely."

March 17, at 4, Downshire Hill, Hampstead, JOHN SCOTT, Esq., aged 71.

March 17, at Glasgow, aged 30, JOHN ASTLEY, son of the late Dr. John Wilson ANDERSON, of Bonnington Chemical Works, Edinburgh.

March 19, at Park-Hill Place, Bolton, JANE, relict of John DEAN, Esq.

MARRIAGES.

Jan. 23, at the High-Pavement chapel, Nottingham, by Rev. P. W. Clayden, Mr. CHARLES EASOM to Miss SARAH HALL, of Nottingham.

Feb. 27, at Lord-Street chapel, Oldham, by Rev. T. C. Holland, THOMAS THORP to HANNAH BAILEY.

March 4, at the High-Pavement chapel, Nottingham, by Rev. P. W. Clayden, Mr. FOX to Miss GODDARD, both of Nottingham.

March 7, at the Old meeting-house, Bessel's Green, near Sevenoaks, by Rev. T. B. W. Briggs, Mr. JOHN AGATE, of Dover, to ELIZA MARY, daughter of Mr. WOOLLEY, of Tunbridge.

March 10, at the Unitarian chapel, Upper Brook Street, Manchester, by Rev. J. Drummond, B.A., JAMES ELLIS to MARY HARTLEY WROE, both of Manchester.

March 13, at Cork, Rev. WILLIAM WHITELEGGE, Presbyterian minister of that city, to ELLIE WINSPEARE, eldest daughter of John W. M'CARTY, Esq., of Cork.

March 14, at Renshaw-Street chapel, Liverpool, by Rev. J. H. Thom, JOSEPH PRIESTLEY TATE, Esq., of Shanghai, China, to HARRIETTE, second daughter of Richard RAWLINSON, Esq., of Liverpool.

March 15, at Blackwater-Street chapel, Rochdale, by Rev. W. Smith, of the Blackfriars, Canterbury, JOHN, youngest son of Joseph WOOD, Esq., banker, The Butts, to ELIZABETH, second daughter of Edmund LEACH, Esq., Summer Castle.

March 17, at the Unitarian chapel, Upper Brook Street, Manchester, by Rev. William Gaskell, M.A., ALFRED, son of Mr. C. DUNKERLEY, to ELIZABETH MARY, daughter of the late Mr. P. TAYLOR, both of Moss-side, near Manchester.

March 17, at Lord-Street chapel, Oldham, by Rev. C. W. Robberds, JOHN GRUNDY to MARTHA WIGHTMORE.

March 19, at the Elder-Yard chapel, Chesterfield, by Rev. Francis Bishop, M. SAMUEL LOWE, of Brampton, to MARTH widow of the late Mr. Samuel SANFORT of the Stone-gravel Pottery, Chesterfield.

THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CLXXXV.] MAY, 1860. [Vol. XVI.

GEORGE HARRIS: A MEMOIR.

Chapter II.

YOUTH AND OPENING MINISTRY.

George Harris was born at Maidstone, Kent, on the 15th of May, in the year 1794. His father was the Rev. Abraham Harris, minister of the Presbyterian chapel, Earl Street, Maidstone. His mother was Hannah, only daughter and child of John Polhill, Esq., Southwark.

Mr. Harris was accustomed to claim descent from Oliver Cromwell. He believed he could trace this descent both on his father's and mother's side. I am informed that he was certainly in error as to his mother's side, although a Thomas Polhill belonging to his mother's family married a daughter of Henry Ireton by Oliver Cromwell's daughter Bridget. The Polhills were a distinguished family in the counties of Kent, Sussex and Bedfordshire, and this Thomas Polhill belonged to a different branch of the family from that with which Mr. Harris was immediately connected. The Kentish Polhills have resided in the county from at least as early as the fourteenth century. As to the descent from Cromwell on the father's side, I am not able to speak for or against it. Mr. Harris had an earthenware porringer which was said to have been used by Oliver when a boy. It was given him by a Welsh aunt, and she had convinced him that the Harris family could claim alliance with the Protector. The porringer was highly prized and religiously cared for—as it ought to have been; for whatsoever connects us, even though it be by a link of the faintest probability, with the heroes and saints of the past, strengthens in our hearts that love for liberty and virtue by means of which we also may contribute to the benefit of our kind. I have no doubt that, though George Harris would have blushed to bring his name side by side with that of Cromwell, it was with an honest pride that, in his many battles for the truth, he imagined it to be the brave old blood he felt tingling in his veins.

The Rev. Abraham Harris was a native of Swansea. He was educated first under Dr. Davies, of Abergavenny, and then at Hoxton College, under Dr. Abraham Rees, Dr. Andrew Kippis and Dr. Savage. He settled at Maidstone very early in life,

and continued there till his death on the 1st of July, 1820. His immediate predecessor in the Maidstone pulpit was the Rev. William Hazlitt, the father of Hazlitt the essayist. He enjoyed the warm friendship of Mr. Belsham, and hence originated the intimate connection that afterwards existed between Mr. Belsham and his son. He was an Unitarian in his theological views, and did not shrink from professing his Unitarianism. He had considerable advantages of appearance and manner, possessed a very cheerful disposition, and was especially liked by the young people of his congregation. He preserved an irreproachable character, and was an estimable member of the class of steady, respectable and liberal divines to which he belonged. His death took place just on the eve of the publication of George Harris's Liverpool Lectures, and the volume opens with a dedication which it would be wrong to omit from any account which relates to the father and son jointly. It breathes the true spirit of the case with a hearty fulness worthy of all admiration.

"This volume is sacred to the memory of a beloved Parent, the Reverend Abraham Harris, of Maidstone, in whose life the influence of the principles of Unitarian Christianity was exemplified in the brightest manner,—by his conduct as a Son, his feeling as a Brother, his affection as a Husband, his instructions as a Father, his integrity as a Man, his actions as a Citizen, and by his faithful and unwearied performance, during a period of forty years, of the arduous duties of a Christian Minister; who was the sincere and fearless advocate of the doctrines he believed to be the Truth of God, and an ardent lover of Civil and Religious Freedom; whose patience under affliction, and resignation during a very agonizing and protracted illness, and whose cheerful and dignified calmness on the prospect of dissolution, afforded another example of the pure, the holy, the all-animating and truly benevolent tendency of the doctrines maintained by the Unitarian Christian."

Mrs. Abraham Harris survived her husband many years, dying in May 1853, at the age of 87. I must place in juxtaposition with the tribute to his father's memory, the no less affecting tribute with which the son honoured the memory of his mother. Its truth is amply confirmed by independent information before me.

"The long years of her widowhood were passed, so long as health and strength permitted, in unceasing efforts of kindness to all whom she could benefit by assistance, counsel and consolation. Confined since 1846 to the bedroom or couch, through paralysis of the lower limbs, a more perfect example of acquiescence in the will of God, of resignation to the Divine appointments, of humble, hopeful, cheerful old age, was never exemplified. Mind triumphed over body. Thoughts of the welfare of others, labour for others, were still the animating principles. Piety, benevolence, pervaded and sanctified the character. Many learned from that couch of suffering, lessons of patience, contentment, concurrence in the disposals of Providence, which will be remembered ever. The beneficent and holy life came to its close in the peacefulness which *had been* its characteristic. The trust in God never wavered. With

hope full of immortality, the tranquil spirit passed to the undying future,—to the re-union of the good and just and pure in the mansions of the Father of mercies."*

Under the training of these excellent parents, George Harris grew up; and the character of that training was ever afterwards deeply impressed upon him. He followed to the end the bent he received at the beginning. It is wonderful to think how the whole of our future course is prepared for and produced by causes that come into operation unconsciously to ourselves and during our weakest age. The milk of family affection which we then imbibe enters into the blood, and is far stronger in its influence upon character than are either the stimulants or the narcotics of after life.

Mr. Harris was educated first at a school kept by Mr. Thomas Pine, and then at the ancient Grammar-school of Maidstone. As a boy he is remembered to have been somewhat shy and reserved, but no particulars relating to the events of his boyhood have come under my notice. The society in which he moved was of course chiefly that of his father's congregation. This society had one peculiarity. Besides including English families of worth and respectability, such as generally gathered round the old Presbyterian interests of that day, it also comprised some descendants of the Huguenots; and the difference of national character gave to the common religious feeling a more varied manifestation than usual. One offshoot of the foreign stock, Mr. Pillow, of Mount Ararat, is said to have presented a remarkable mixture of English sturdiness and French vivacity. Between him and the minister a most cordial attachment existed, which was cemented by a similar musical taste; and when their earthly separation came, it was observed that the French horn or German flute was taken from its resting-place by the old man of the hill with a feeling of sadness unknown before. The love for the father was freely extended to the son.

The original destination of Mr. Harris was to a commercial life, and when rather more than fourteen years of age he was placed in a Manchester warehouse in Lawrence Lane, Cheapside, London. The principals of the house were relations of his family, and thus he had the fairest prospects of being helped forward in a career, for the successful pursuit of which he had many natural qualifications. There is no doubt that had he followed out the design of his friends, he would have attained to eminence in the line of business chosen for him.

I am able to trace his course when launched upon the great metropolis, by means of some letters to his father which have been preserved. Setting aside their references to family affairs, the chief, I may almost say the only, topics discussed in these

* Christian Reformer, New Series, Vol. IX. p. 534.

letters are politics and Unitarianism. The interests of his life thus opened as they were destined to proceed.

The political opinions expressed are those of an extreme Radicalism, and the method of expression breathes the peculiar ardour of youthful enthusiasm. It is clear that his whole heart was in the cause, though he represents it as a cause which had fallen on evil days.

It was, however, with a different feeling that he regarded Unitarianism. He evidently considered that to be a cause which was in one of the early stages of a triumphant progress, and he rejoiced over its successes with a pleasure intensified by the most sanguine hope. He attached himself to the Essex-Street congregation, and was specially noticed and most kindly treated by the minister, Mr. Belsham. The kind of championship which was conceded to Mr. Belsham by his admirers appears rather amusingly in some of the references which the young letter-writer makes. Thus he tells his father that some one who accompanied him to chapel said, "Mr. Belsham is the cleverest man in the world." He appears to have gone to all the public services he could attend that bore upon the celebrity of his faith, and to have given to them a most zealous appreciation. Thus, in describing the opening by Mr. Aspland of the New Gravel-Pit chapel at Hackney, he says,—

"Got there about eleven. For a long time could not get a seat, and then not down stairs, but had at last a very good one in the gallery. The place was quite full. A very long sermon, an hour and twenty minutes, but at which I was not at all tired, but could have sat for hours and listened with pleasure."

One letter is occupied with an account of the Unitarian Fund dinner at the London Tavern in 1810. Mr. Aspland had given him a free ticket to the dinner, and he had obtained the consent of his employers to attend. This was his first acquaintance with such an entertainment, and the impression of a gratified curiosity pervades the description. I fancy him looking at this scene:

"Mr. Wright, you know, is a short man. When he rose, there was an universal cry of, 'On the chair—on the chair!' He got on the chair. Another cry of, 'Mr. Wright on the table!' So he mounted the table, when we gave him three rounds of applause. I think he made the best speech. He is quite an enthusiast. He said that in his opinion, if there was not an Unitarian south of the Tweed, there would be enough north of it to Unitarianize the world. He sat down amid repeated shouts of applause."

Little did he think that a large part of his own life was to be spent in following up the labours north of the Tweed of the little man he saw upon the table, and that he would have far more experience than any other man, little or big, of what that northern Unitarianism would and would not be, and could and could not do.

We now come to the main crisis of his life. In December, 1811, he sent an earnest appeal, addressed to his father and mother, for permission to devote himself to the Christian ministry. He commences and concludes the application with a prayer to the God of all mercy and truth that He would be graciously pleased to dispose the hearts of his parents to grant his request, and he pursues his object with every argument and entreaty that the case admitted of. A case of more spontaneous choice and settled persuasion in favour of the work which he begs to undertake can scarcely exist. The manner in which he urges his suit shews clearly that he was conscious of having strong objections to combat, and he sets himself to remove them in detail. He had to withstand both the hope of advantage in his present situation, and the fear of expense in his contemplated change, and he did so with all his might, and with a prudence and manliness singular for his years; but the point on which he most insisted, and to which he continually returned, was the necessity to his own spiritual welfare of the course of life upon which his heart was set. Before this letter was finished the father had written to Mr. Belsham, in answer to a similar application from him, urging Mr. B. to use his utmost endeavours to dissuade the son from leaving his present situation; and he had followed up this adverse reply to George's friendly advocate by a strong remonstrance to George himself. The latter part of the letter is therefore occupied with a renewed entreaty formed to meet these adverse circumstances. It is pleasing to record that, in spite of the previous disinclination, the prayer of this letter was almost immediately granted; for on December 30, the suppliant breaks forth with—

"Thanks, ten thousand thanks, my dear father and mother, for agreeing to my wishes! I am sure I need not again repeat that love and gratitude will always inspire my breast when I think on your kindness to me, particularly in this last instance."

One main occasion of the impulse toward the ministry under which he so strenuously acted, is thus mentioned by himself in a speech which, thirteen years afterwards, he delivered on occasion of Mr. Grundy's removal from Manchester to Liverpool:

"Mr. Grundy may, perhaps, be surprised, but I hope not displeased, when I state to this company that it was principally owing to the sentiments which I heard him deliver in London in the year 1811, and to the exertions which he made to diffuse a spirit of inquiry in this town —the influence of which has been felt through the kingdom—that I was led to quit the business in which I was at that time engaged, and devote myself to the Christian ministry."

It was the wish of his friends that he should be admitted into Coward's College, which was then located at Wymondley, in Hertfordshire, and he obtained every reasonable assurance that such would be the case. As, however, this admission could not take

place till July, he was in the meanwhile sent, for the purpose of undergoing the needful preparation, to an academy kept at Islington by the Rev. John Evans. He was then in the eighteenth year of his age.

Dr. Evans, as he afterwards became, was for a long period minister of the Worship-Street General Baptist chapel. He was an Arian in theological opinion, but more distinguished for the advocacy of religious charity and forbearance than for any decided doctrinal views. His Arminian and Baptist belief formed the most determined part of his creed. He was the author of the well-known *Sketch of the Denominations of the Christian World*,—a book 100,000 copies of which were circulated previous to his death in 1827. He conducted a school, first at Hoxton Square, and afterwards at Islington, for thirty years; and in connection with his general teaching, he superintended, during a part of that time, the education of young men for the Christian ministry. He was an amiable and respectable man, who employed himself much in the production of minor religious and ecclesiastical publications, and works for the instruction of youth. For a number of years before his death he was deprived of the use of his lower limbs; but he continued his academical duties till 1825, and conducted his pulpit services to the very last, being carried into the chapel by his sons. He was an agreeable preacher, and the animation of his manner quite counteracted the influence of the bodily infirmity under which he laboured.

Mr. Harris remained under Dr. Evans's care for six months; but scarcely three months of that time had elapsed when he obtained, mainly through Mr. Belsham's influence, an exhibition to the Glasgow University on the foundation of Dr. Williams's Trust. The Coward's College scheme was thus put aside by the partiality of one who, for his own as well as for his father's sake, never failed to regard him with the strongest attachment. The most distinctive circumstance relative to his connection with Dr. Evans's academy that has passed under my notice is, that in the dramatic performances by which the school duties were occasionally enlivened, he was the star of the company. *Cato* and *The Wags of Windsor* were presented during his pupilage, and he appeared in the characters of the great Roman and Caleb Quotem with very marked success; his boyish audience recognizing the same rhetorical superiority that afterwards drew forth the admiration of audiences of men.

In November, 1812, Mr. Harris entered the University of Glasgow, and remained a student there during three sessions. I have nothing to report as to his College studies; but I have something to say as to the how and why of this lack of information. For scholastic exercises he had not much natural aptitude, nor had he been favoured with the training which might have developed the fitness he possessed. His interest had been strongly

excited in another direction, coinciding with the demands of the profession into which he was about to enter. The special form of the theology for whose advancement he had chosen that profession, so far attracted as almost to absorb his attention. He was the very opposite of indifferent or idle as to what he felt to be most important to the work lying before him; but it was the practical application of that work, which his feelings contemplated, not the learned preparation it might require. It would have been well for some of the exigencies of his after-course that more extensive knowledge had been possessed by him, but I doubt if that course as a whole would have been so efficiently pursued if he had not at its commencement acted as he did. I know very well that, whatever he might have allowed in depreciation of his own practice, he would have vindicated the position of individuals situated as he was, against the exclusive claims of a learned ministry. He did offer such a vindication, when, years after, a change was made in the terms of granting exhibitions on Dr. Williams's foundation, which, if it had taken place before his time, would, in all probability, have deprived him of his exhibition.

"Learning to all professions is a valuable pre-requisite, and to none more so than the ministry. But is learning comprehended merely in classic erudition? Are there not other and higher qualifications than its possession? The piety which devotes its powers a glad sacrifice to the God who gave them—the love of man willing to spend and to be spent for human good—the purity and fervency of soul which looks to the ministry as a holy and powerful instrument of elevating and blessing society—the zeal and devotedness which is interested in all that interests man, and knows nothing of indifference or apathy but by name—these are qualifications for the ministry which should be sought out, encouraged, aided and made efficient to the hallowed objects they would assuredly accomplish. It is to be feared that too little is thought of the masses, and too much of privileged orders; and any plan which has a tendency to raise up teachers for a class rather than for the people is greatly to be deprecated. Will not this be the tendency of the present mode of procedure? Will not young men of humble circumstances, who are of the people, and know their virtues and their wants, and can sympathize in their feelings, and can speak to their minds and hearts, be deterred from becoming applicants for these exhibitions? There is a worse evil than that of an unlearned ministry—a ministry sought after as a genteel profession, looking about for respectable society only, and regardless of the improvement of the poor—delighting in painted butterflies and the concord of sweet sounds, rather than in preaching peace to the afflicted and imparting instruction to the ignorant."*

I cannot but consider such sentiments as these in the light of the fact that the present wants of our churches have forced into existence an institution—the Home Missionary Board—which has immediately in view the preparation for the ministry of young

* Christian Pioneer, Vol. X. p. 464.

men who have not had opportunities for a learned education. Whether a separate institution for this purpose is, theoretically, the best mode of meeting these wants, may lie open to some question; but the practical operation of this institution has established the necessity of the kind of ministerial supply it affords. I rejoice at this state of things, though I am aware of the dangers to which it exposes us; and I desire never to forget on any such matter as the one now before me that it was asked with relation to the great Teacher himself, "How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?"

There is no doubt that Mr. Harris derived great benefit from his attendance at the Glasgow College, and the influence of the instruction he there received is to be distinctly traced in many a subsequent transaction; but the Unitarian movements in which he engaged tended more to form his character than anything belonging to a college curriculum. Into those movements he threw himself heart and soul, and was "instant, in season and out of season," in the doing of whatever might promote their success.

Unitarianism in Scotland was, at the time of which I am speaking, rising into more hopeful circumstances. The present Dr. Southwood Smith was minister of the Unitarian congregation in Edinburgh, and Mr. James Yates occupied the corresponding situation in Glasgow. The superior talents of these two eminent men gave both character and impulse to the cause with which they were connected. They each published a work of sterling and permanent value bearing upon the Unitarian controversy. Smith's *Illustrations of the Divine Government* and Yates's *Vindication of Unitarianism* are books of which any religious body may justly be proud. A new chapel had been built at Glasgow, and an inconvenient hall had been exchanged for a chapel in Edinburgh. Missionary operations were undertaken in various parts of the country, and met with very remarkable success. Everywhere there appeared a disposition to profit by Unitarian preaching, provided the fitting agencies could be employed. The situation of affairs created the excitement connected with a necessity of straining every effort in order to compass a part of the work to be done; for after all efforts had been exhausted, there would still remain the consciousness that very much of the work was left undone. It was specially a case in which "the harvest was great, but the labourers were few." This description is characteristic of the whole time of Mr. Harris's student-life in Glasgow, and to the existing emergency he adapted himself. Can I say that he yielded to the temptation which this state of things presented? Ought I not rather to say that he fulfilled the service which it called upon him to discharge?

There was one want which was felt with particular urgency. Some general organization was required which might collect the

ıttered forces together, and secure their greater efficiency by ncerted operations. The advantage of a deeper and more tive sympathy would alone justify the effort to form such an ganization. This want was attempted to be supplied by the stitution of the Scotch Unitarian Association. The first meet-g of that body was held July 28, 1813. Mr. Harris not only tached himself to this Association from the first, but was one its chief originators. Perhaps it may be said to have owed ı authorship to him more than to any other individual. Though other person was appointed Secretary at the inaugural meet-g, he seems from the beginning to have acted more or less in at capacity; and at the second meeting he was formally placed that office, which he retained till he left Scotland in 1816. ny one who peruses the Reports of this institution during his ·cretaryship, must be convinced that a great deal of hard and ntinuous labour devolved upon him in connection with it; and ere can but be few instances upon record of one so young as ı was fulfilling the kind of responsibilities which that labour ıplied. To say he fulfilled them satisfactorily, is to give but a int idea of the commendation with which they were acknow-dged. His "zeal, ability, perseverance and unremitted efforts," e recorded with a personal distinction unusual under the cir-ımstances, and indicating that his was the ruling spirit of the ıovement.

The Association meeting of 1813 was held in Edinburgh, and ı the report of it it is said, "Mr. G. Harris, of Maidstone, con-ucted the devotional part of the service." This was only nine ıonths after he came to Glasgow, and when he was but nineteen ears of age. He had, of course, preached before this. He had ıdeed supplied the Edinburgh pulpit before, and I suppose it as his acceptableness there which led to his being selected for ıe duty I have just noted. His first sermon was preached at 'aisley on Sunday, January 10, 1813. He sent to his father the ıllowing account of the adventure:

"Sweet took me over to Paisley in a gig last Sunday week. We opped at the New Inn. Paisley appears to be a large town, though e did not walk about much. The place where the Unitarians meet is ırough a small public-house, down a yard, and then up a few steps into very fair apartment, capable of holding perhaps 200, with a rostrum, c., erected in it. Here, then, I preached in the morning to about 50 rsons, who were all very attentive, from Romans ix. 1—3: 'I say ıe truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in ıe Holy Ghost, that I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my art. For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my ethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh.' I attempted to give a tional interpretation to this declaration of Paul, in opposition to the hoolmen and mystics, then took a survey of the apostle's zeal in the use of truth, and concluded with an appeal to them on the absolute cessity and duty of speaking out. They were much pleased. Sweet,

Gaskell (who walked with Mr. Plenderleith to Paisley) and myself dined off a beefsteak at the inn; and in the afternoon I preached again to 70 people, from the prophet Daniel, about Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego. They all pressed me amazingly to come again, which I told them I did not think I could do, as I had much to do at the College, but perhaps I might, once, before the close of the session. I then set off for Glasgow. They were, I understand by Gaskell, much chagrined by my not staying to tea with them, as they wished to hear about the Unitarians in England, which I shall do the next time I go there. They appear to me, from what I saw of them, to be very clever men. They are principally, not among the common orders nor the middle one, but between these two. If they met in a better and more respectable place, they would, I conceive, get on more. This, I believe, they now see the necessity of, and intend to do."

From this time he appears to have employed himself in occasional preaching whenever opportunities were presented. Having put his hand to the plough, he did not look back. The result of these exertions was, that in 1815 he became intimately connected with Greenock in a semi-ministerial capacity. The history of this connection was thus given by the Secretary of the Committee of the Greenock and Port-Glasgow Unitarian Fund in the Monthly Repository for that year:

"Greenock, August 16, 1815.

"In consequence of the resolutions of the last meeting of the Scotch Unitarian Association to send out missionaries, Mr. George Harris, their Secretary, was appointed by the Committee to preach at Greenock on Sunday, the 16th of July last. By means of advertisements and the exertions of a few friends, the attention of the public was somewhat excited, and nearly 300 persons, being about as many as the place of meeting would seat, were present at the service. The congregation on the succeeding Sunday was still more numerous. A spirit of inquiry now appeared to be generally prevalent, and hitherto continues. Unitarianism is introduced into general conversation, and has attracted notice in the most respectable circles. In this state of the public mind, the erection of a chapel in Greenock for Unitarian worship has become extremely desirable. In the mean time, Mr. Harris is going on with a course of lectures on the distinguishing doctrines of Unitarianism, once a fortnight, which are well attended."*

"Greenock, Nov. 14, 1815.

"The course of lectures formerly stated to have been commenced by Mr. Harris, was continued once a fortnight in the original place of meeting, until from a want of accommodation the Committee procured the theatre, where the two last lectures were delivered. At the first of these there was an audience of about 1000 people, while several hundreds could find no admission. At the lecture last Sunday evening the theatre was also filled and numbers went away.

"The spirit of inquiry which was then mentioned to be generally prevalent, appears to have suffered no diminution, notwithstanding repeated attempts have been made to crush it on the part of the orthodox,

* Monthly Repository, Vol. X. p. 528.

and anathemas launched openly from the pulpit against such as attend our meetings. It is with a reference to the existence of this spirit amongst the inhabitants that Greenock is to be viewed as a situation highly favourable for diffusing primitive Christianity; and by the continued development of this disposition, the Committee feel themselves excited to strain every nerve to raise on this spot 'a temple to reason, to free inquiry, to individual judgment.' They therefore hope to be forgiven for pressing into notice this important feature of the public mind in this place, and for again bringing forward the erection of a chapel in Greenock to the worship of the One God through the One Mediator, as an object worthy of support.

"The Committee cannot close this communication without publicly expressing the high sense they entertain of the value of Mr. Harris's labours. With a zeal truly apostolic, he travels fifty miles once a fortnight to visit us *without remuneration*, and in the midst of academical business composes discourses at once perspicuous and animated."*

Subscriptions toward the erection of the contemplated chapel in Greenock were immediately commenced. The cost of the erection was estimated at about £800. In Greenock and Port Glasgow themselves nearly £300 were given, and various small sums were received from England as well as from other places in Scotland. Under these circumstances it was resolved that Mr. Harris should make a tour in England for the purpose of increasing the fund; and he entered upon it in the summer of 1816.

Before leaving Scotland on this expedition, he had issued his first printed publication. It is entitled, *A Statement of the Principles of Unitarian Christianity, addressed to the Inhabitants of Greenock and Port Glasgow and to the Friends of Free Inquiry throughout Scotland, by a Unitarian.* It is not an original composition, nor does it profess to be so. The writer of it calls it a compilation, and calls himself the editor, not the author, of it. It was, however, well selected and arranged, and admirably adapted to its purpose. I have no doubt that it was more useful as an Unitarian manual than any original production would have been, and it remains a testimony to the practical sagacity with which its compiler perceived and met the special wants of the case with which he had to do. He put aside, too, all vanity of literary reputation in deference to the substantial interests of the cause he desired to promote.

In connection with Mr. Harris, Messrs. Russell and John Gaskell volunteered their services as missionaries to the Scottish Unitarian Association. Mr. Gaskell was then a Glasgow student. He afterwards became the minister of Thorne, and finally settled and died at Dukinfield. As one of his successors in the latter charge, I am glad to take this opportunity of bearing testimony to the respect and affection in which his memory is held

* Monthly Repository, Vol. X. p. 722.

among the members of my present congregation. There was in addition to the voluntary labourers, one paid missionary of the Association, and the result of the united exertions of these parties, assisted and directed by the ministers of Edinburgh and Glasgow, was, that in the year 1816 there were forty-two places in Scotland in which some effort was made toward the spread of Unitarianism, or where the existence of this form of Christian belief was at least recognized.

When our young apostle turned his feet southward in order to gather "gifts and offerings" for the temple in which he intended to minister, it was with a hopeful feeling that would give a kind of national importance to the prospect of his ministry. That a lad as he was should have been able to crowd into a theatre—of all places—a thousand inhabitants of a Scotch town, eager to hear the cherished dogmas of the religion of Scotland denied and denounced, was no common nor unimportant thing. One might excuse on his part a little pride of recollection, and a little confidence of anticipation, as but natural to his circumstances.

Some months were spent by Mr. Harris in this begging journey through England. I cannot accurately trace his progress from place to place, but I find him at Sheffield, at the meeting of the Eastern Unitarian Society in Ipswich, and in London. A glimpse of his appearance in one of the pulpits of the metropolis has been given to me thus:—"My first sight of our friend was after Mr. Vidler's death, in Parliament Court. I was then a seatholder there. His text was—'What doest thou here, Elijah?' He told us that we should not skulk in corners, but come boldly out and say our say to all the world. I was very much pleased with him. His elocution was all that I could wish."

Wherever he preached he produced the same kind of impression he had produced in Scotland. Every one who heard him was struck with his great oratorical power, which was as marked in its character at the beginning as it was in any subsequent period of his ministry. It was indeed perfectly natural to the man, and was cultivated by him in a mere attention to nature. Some persons have thought that it was by careful and persevering effort in following certain rules of art that he made himself the accomplished speaker he was. But such was not the case. I have it on good authority that he professed no principles of elocution at all, but was always guided by an instinct or emotion of fitness; and I have no doubt that it was this naturalness of qualification which gave him the superiority he possessed. No process of imitation or obedience to laws of address could have resulted in the effects he displayed. His manner of statement and appeal was born with him, as certainly as were his fine person and rich voice. He has been often copied, but the resemblance produced was never so striking as the unlikeness which could not be

:d. There exists a rather remarkable evidence of his dis-
ıation in relation to the matter of public speaking. Not
ıfter his settlement in Glasgow as the minister of the con-
tion there, he published a volume entitled, *Select Pieces*
ading and Recitation. It was not till a short time ago
knew of the existence of such a work; and on being told
I was very anxious to peruse a copy in order to test his
and feeling on a subject so nearly connected with the means
own influence. On reading the book I was surprised that
not come under my notice before—surprised, indeed, that
not attained a wide and general popularity. I have been
ned that the theological prejudice of Scotland strangled it
birth. Had it become known at all, it must, I think, have
very extensively used. I have never met with a book of
ind which I think so well fitted for the class of learners for
it was intended; and it happened that just at the time
ined it, I was obliged, for a very different purpose from
which led me to examine this, to look over some other
r books. But what I wish now to say is, that my idea of
ıturalness of Mr. Harris's oratorical skill was much increased
e whole character and plan of these selections, for they
ite both a delicacy and strength of judgment which nothing
n inborn acuteness of perception could give. Tried thus
s appreciation of the writings of others, the sterling cha-
of the means on which he depended for effect in his own
becomes clearly apparent. His rhetoric was as real as it
otable.

nay as well here finish my account of the object of Mr.
s's English tour by saying that the projected chapel was
at Port Glasgow, near to Greenock, and opened by him
ınday, January 20th, 1822; and that two of the three ser-
he preached on that occasion were published in compliance
ıddresses of the most pressing kind sent to him by different
s of his hearers.

AN HEREDITARY CREED PASSIVELY RECEIVED.

ıw are seen the cases, so frequent in this age of the world as almost
a the majority, in which the creed remains as it were outside the
encrusting and petrifying it against all other influences addressed
higher parts of our nature; manifesting its power by not suffering
eah and living conviction to get in, but itself doing nothing for
ind or heart, except standing sentinel over them to keep them
."—*Mill on Liberty.*

A REJOINDER TO SOME ADDITIONAL STRICTURES ON AN ARTICLE IN THE NATIONAL REVIEW ON "EWALD'S APOSTOLIC AGE."*

THE foregoing view of the origin and development of our gospel narratives will explain how I conceive it possible that, under the various shaping of traditional influence, two forms of the belief in the resurrection, one growing out of the other, should early have got into circulation, and have left distinct traces of themselves on the record which has come down to us. I do not deny that there are passages which, without a forced interpretation, can only be understood of a bodily resurrection in the strictest sense. But, again, there are others which seem to me wholly irreconcilable with such a supposition. It is a choice of difficulties which press on my opponents as strongly as on myself. I choose what I feel to be the least of the two difficulties, and consider the last set of passages to exhibit the original, and what I believe to be the true, view of the case. I am confirmed in this opinion by Paul's distinct and trustworthy account of his *sight* of the risen Christ. This allows me to accept the resurrection as a *historical reality*, i.e. as a fact witnessed by the experience of persons living on earth, without incurring the insuperable difficulties and the loss of all consoling application, which attach to the assumption of a restoration of the old flesh and blood from the grave. It is observable, that the earliest notices of this event are the simplest and briefest. The indications of a corporeal presence thicken, as it were, in the later accounts. Matthew, Mark and John agree in stating that the first appearance was to Mary Magdalene, after she had found the grave abandoned. John says she was alone; the two former represent her as accompanied by other women. Luke reports no appearance before that which occurred to the two disciples on their walk to Emmaus, and says that Mary Magdalene and the other women simply announced the empty grave to the disciples. From the combined impression of the statements of all the evangelists, we gather that the account of the disappearance of the body from the sepulchre came upon the disciples as a surprise; when they were told of the resurrection of their Lord, they did not believe.† So far all the narratives are in substantial harmony; subsequent to this point there is considerable variation between them. The only appearance, besides that to the two Marys, which is recorded by Matthew (xxviii. 17), took place in Galilee on a mountain where Jesus had appointed to meet them.

---

* Continued from p. 237.

† The surprise of the disciples on finding the grave forsaken, is against Ewald's supposition that they had any hand in removing the body. If it was removed, Joseph of Arimathea must, for some reason of his own, have secretly taken it away without the cognizance of the disciples, and never disclosed the place of final interment. I do not wish to disguise the difficulty of this part of the subject.

is described in these few simple words: καὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν προσεκύνησαν, οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν.* In Mark, after the appearance to Mary agdalene, two other appearances are mentioned, and in very markable terms.† To two of the disciples as they were walkg into the country (this is evidently the same occasion as the lk to Emmaus, Luke xxiv. 13—35), ἐφανερώθη ἐν ἑτέρᾳ μορφῇ. oth these expressions are significant and deserve notice. I have ready observed, that φανερόω in some of the Gospels is the equilent of ἀποκαλύπτω, and that both these terms, as used in the hristian Scriptures, denote specifically a divine manifestation—mething that presents itself unexpectedly and out of the ordiry way to the mind. I cannot believe that this term would ve been employed to express the ordinary appearance of a man body.‡ Then what can be meant by appearing *in another form?* This implies something wholly inconsistent with any the known conditions of the permanent identity of a human dy. The word ἐφανερώθη occurs a second time in describing appearance to the eleven as they reclined at supper. In imediate sequence, with the interval of only a few verses containg his last instructions, and without the intimation of any change perinduced on his corporeal frame, this same being,—ὃς τοῖς δεκα ἐφανερώθη,—μετὰ τὸ λαλῆσαι αὐτοῖς ἀνελήμφθη εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐκάθισεν ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ. If the former part of this passage to be understood of an ordinary human body, it is a very arbiary proceeding to substitute another meaning in the latter part; nd if we interpret both parts of a proper body, as alone we now it to exist on earth, how are we to conceive of the fact of a ascension into heaven and of a sitting down at the right hand f God?

According to Matthew and Mark, the appearances to the isciples were in Galilee. If we interpret Luke's account by self, we must conclude that the disciples remained in Jerusalem ll the ascension (xxiv. 13, 33, 49). This evangelist omits all otice of the appearance to Mary Magdalene and the other women. he risen Jesus, he tells us, first appeared to two disciples as they alked to Emmaus. I have expressed in a former communica-

---

* The οἱ δὲ implies a suppressed οἱ μὲν before προσεκύνησαν. See Winer, ramm. N. T. § xvii. 2,—whose explanation seems to me preferable to that of itzsche, who gives the aorist a pluperfect force, and renders it, "but they had ubted."

† The latter part of Mark's Gospel (xvi. 9—20), where these appearances are corded, is wanting in the Vatican MS. and the Eusebian Canons. I know that r. Means affirms its authenticity; and as it occurs in the great majority of MSS., do not see why it should not be adduced as a witness of early belief respecting e resurrection. The four last verses occur among the fragments of the old yriac version recently published by Dr. Cureton.

‡ I find that De Wette (in loc. Kurzgef Exeget. Handb. N. T.) gives the word similar interpretation: "Dieser Ausdruck führt auf eine geisterhafte Erscheiung" (*This expression suggests the appearance of a spirit*). Luther on both occaons renders it, "offenbarete er sich," i. e. *he revealed himself.*

tion the extreme difficulty that I feel in understanding this narrative, if we take Christ's appearance on this occasion to have been strictly corporeal. Nor has that difficulty been removed by anything which my friend Mr. Means has alleged in explanation. According to the ordinary dress of the Jews of that day, the hands and feet would be naturally exposed. There is something strained and artificial in my friend's suggestion, that the hands were constantly muffled in the upper garment during a long walk of many miles. The sandal, not the shoe, was the common wear; and it is not likely that in the hot season and with a recent wound, Jesus would exceptionally subject his feet to the irritation of a leather covering. I think my friend's supposition is quite as "gratuitous" as my own, that "the marks on the hands and the feet" must have been conspicuous. I ventured to say, in a previous communication, that such an expression as ἄφαντος ἐγένετο ἀπ' αὐτῶν would never have been used of the ordinary departure of a human body. That opinion I still hold. Mr. Means talks of "our translators having unwisely used the ghost-like word, 'vanished'" (p. 148). To me they seem rather to have followed their sound philological instinct without thinking of possible controversies, and given the word its just and obvious rendering. I regard it as the counterpart of ἐφανερώθη in the corresponding narrative in Mark, and suppose it, like this latter word, to indicate something distinct from an ordinary human appearance.* Soon after this first appearance occurs the second, when Christ suddenly stood in the midst of the eleven and the other two disciples as they were talking of him. With this is connected his declaration that he was not a mere spirit, his exhibition of his hands and feet, his request that they would handle him as having flesh and bones, and his eating of fish and honeycomb before them. At the end of his discourse with them on this occasion, he is said to have led them out as far as Bethany, and in the act of blessing them, to have been separated (διέστη) from them and carried up to heaven (ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν). In John, three

* Luther renders it, like our translators, "Er verschwand vor ihnen" *(He vanished before them)*. Finding my remark on the natural meaning of ἄφαντος called in question by my friend, I have endeavoured, as far as I could, to trace its use in other authors. It is marked by Liddell and Scott in their Lexicon as a poetical word; but like many such, it has found its way into the mixed Hellenic dialect of a later age. It occurs in Homer, Pindar and the Tragedians; and in every passage which I have had the opportunity of examining, it has the meaning of *sudden and complete disappearance*. Compare Iliad, vi. 60, and xx. 303; Pindar, Olymp. i. 72, ἄφαντος ἔπελες, of the carrying off of Pelops to heaven; Æschyl. Suppl. 788, of dissipation into smoke and cloud; Agamemn. 633, of the unexplained disappearance of Menelaus from the Grecian army; and the following passages of the same play, 666, 704, 1016. On one of these passages, Stanley remarks, "Scite ἄφαντος, de rebus non indagandis."—Since making these collections, I find that De Wette, on this very passage of Luke, quotes in illustration, 2 Maccabees iii. 34, ἀφανεῖς ἐγένοντο, of the disappearance of angels, and Eurip. Orest. 1557, ὃν τέθνηκεν, ἀλλ' ἄφαντος οἴχεται, of the mysterious vanishing away of Helen.

distinct appearances are recorded, subsequent to the one to Mary Magdalene in the garden, accompanied by the remarkable words, "Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father" (xx. 17); first, on the evening of the day of his resurrection, when, the doors being shut for fear of the Jews, he came and stood in the midst of them (this seems the same occasion as that described in Luke xxiv. 36; the form of expression is identical, ἔστη ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν, and εἰς τὸ μέσον); secondly, on the same day, a week later, when he appears among them in the same manner, and asks Thomas to convince himself by thrusting his hand into his side; thirdly, in Galilee, at the Sea of Tiberias, when he takes bread and fish and gives to the disciples, and joins with them in their morning meal (ἤρίστησαν). This third appearance is described as φανέρωσις (xx. 1, 14).—What I would now remark on this review of the several manifestations of Jesus, is this: that with only two of them is associated any account of his eating with his disciples, and this in the two latest of the evangelists, in Luke and in the concluding chapter of John, which is now regarded on strong grounds by the best critics as unauthentic, a subsequent appendix to the original gospel. It is only in these two latest gospels, the date of which it is impossible to fix (Papias has left us no information respecting their origin, as he has of Matthew and Mark), that we find any mention made of Christ's subjecting the reality of his resurrection to the evidence of touch. What I must still regard as the oldest narratives, those of Matthew and Mark, give no hint of anything of the kind.

The Unitarian Minister in recent communications to your pages, and in one which I infer to have been also his some years ago (C. R., March, 1857), has argued against accepting the accounts of the ascension literally, because "the scripture narratives of the moment of that event are very vague and quite unsatisfactory to any one who insists on knowing all about it." He adds, "If Ewald had expressed doubts whether there was evidence to prove *a visible bodily ascension*, I might be content to doubt it too." He lays stress on the fact, that neither Matthew nor John allude to the ascension, which he calls negative evidence against the fact. He talks of a "psychological starting-point" for the vision, in Christ's disappearance after forty days' residence in Galilee, with his remembered declaration that he was returning to God, and the subsequent reception of miraculous gifts by his apostles (C. R., October, 1859, p. 589). In another place (C. R., March, 1857, p. 163), he speaks of the "outward miracle as having been designed to symbolize to the outward eyes of the disciples the fact of his transference to that spiritual state of being, the nature and locality of which are still wholly unrevealed." I am unable to understand the reasonableness of the Unitarian Minister's claiming a right to treat the statements about the ascension as he does, and his denying to me an equal right

to consider other passages, on grounds which seem to me equally strong, as irreconcilable with the fact of a bodily resurrection. The distinction between the two cases is quite arbitrary. The accounts of the ascension are perfectly clear and distinct as far as they go; and if they increase in distinctness of detail with each successive account, and this be thought to indicate the growth of tradition, this is no more than what I contend is the case with the alleged proofs of a tangible corporeal resurrection. Matthew, and Mark who represents the tradition of Peter, never allude to such proofs. If from the silence of two of the evangelists, the Unitarian Minister contends that "the negative evidence" in favour of his view of the ascension is very strong, I can claim precisely the same amount of negative evidence against the facts which are most forcibly urged on me in proof of a bodily resurrection. If he assumes a "psychological starting-point," I may surely be allowed to take one too. But in fact the accounts of the ascension join on continuously with the whole previous narrative of the resurrection. There is no break between them. If we permit ourselves to understand the former symbolically, we forfeit the right to insist on the latter in its whole extent being taken literally. Again, the Unitarian Minister will excuse my observing, that I really do not know what he means when he says, that "the outward miracle of the ascension symbolizes a transference to a spiritual state of being." On the supposition of the bodily resurrection of Christ, we are here, I presume, dealing with a fact, not with an idea. Either, therefore, the body ascended into heaven, which is what three accounts distinctly state; or it remained on earth, to die at last in the ordinary way; or the corporeal body must have been transformed into an ethereal substance at the moment of transition, of which none of the evangelists give the remotest hint. No other supposition is possible.

The same writer further argues (C. R., February, 1860, p. 83) that no historical evidence can be brought for a spiritual resurrection that will or ought to satisfy his mind. His reason is, that the witness of such resurrection could only be subjective. But the difficulty is not greater in the case of a spiritual resurrection, than in that of a bodily one, on the evidence recorded in the New Testament. For till it has been shewn by some stronger evidence than mere assertion, in opposition to all extant facts and the recorded testimony of an apostle (Acts x. 41) that Christ ever manifested himself to any but chosen witnesses among believers, we have nothing ultimately to fall back upon but their word; and if we cannot believe that, for the profound conviction with which it was uttered, for the felt truth that is in it, and for the spiritual power that has accompanied it, we must for ever remain outside the Church of Christ, as I see the matter, and have our portion with the unbelievers. The Unitarian Minister and Mr. Bache express their fears lest the principle of spiritual-

ixing the accounts of the resurrection should be extended to the whole narrative of Christ's ministry and convert the gospel into a Docetic vision. The Unitarian Minister has himself set the example of applying this principle to the ascension; and if there be no natural and obvious limits to its application, he is quite as responsible for the mischief as I am. In fact, he preceded me in his published writings in this mode of interpretation. But the apprehension is perfectly groundless. There is a perceptible difference, as every reader of the gospels must feel, between the narrative of events from the baptism to the crucifixion, and that which precedes and follows the period of Christ's public ministry. In the former, no one can reasonably doubt that the substance is properly historical. In the latter, whatever truths may be intended to be conveyed, whatever facts even may be indicated, it is to me quite evident that they are not represented in the same direct, historical way, and are dependent, it may be inferred, on a different kind of evidence.* But independently of this, the public death of Jesus, attested not only by Christian but also by heathen documents, presents an impassable barrier, effectually hindering the extension of any principle of interpretation which may seem to have been required by the peculiar character of the narrative of events following the resurrection, to the longer and distincter and more objective history which precedes it. I think this distinction, which is a broad and palpable one, furnishes a sufficient reply to the objection of the Unitarian Minister, that my theory of the resurrection invalidates the historical character and the historical evidences of Christianity. I have drawn no inference from Paul's personal knowledge of the risen Jesus, from which it could be rationally concluded, that Christ's history *previous* to the crucifixion consisted of a series of spiritual manifestations; and I am not answerable for the irrational conclusions of other people. The inferences which I have drawn from Paul's language and conduct are expressly *limited*, by the object for which I draw them, to the mysterious period which immediately *followed* the crucifixion. There are peculiarities attaching to the phenomena recorded here, though the narrative is tinged, as I think, by some conceptions resulting from the growth of a later tradition, which seem to me most easily explicable by assimilating them with Paul's description of his own spiritual experience. But this explanation of phenomena of a very peculiar kind, cannot possibly be applied by any fair reasoner to phenomena of a totally different character and belonging to quite another sphere. The Unitarian Minister's own exegetical necessities have compelled him to abandon a literal interpretation for one portion of

* With the introductory narratives of Matthew and Luke none have allowed themselves a more *uncritical* licence than certain writers of the old Unitarian school. A freer exegesis and less dread of doctrinal results might have saved their criticism.

this narrative. Who, I ask, gives him special authority to draw an arbitrary line of distinction between statements, all belonging to the same mysterious period and all marked by the same mysterious character? Viewed exegetically, they all stand on precisely the same footing. I can see no difference between them. They are all, according to the view taken of them, equally clear or equally obscure. To represent me as having given any ground for such reasoning as this,—"What Paul knew by these manifestations we take as the 'proper point of departure' for our knowledge of Christ, because Paul's Epistles were written before any of the Gospels,"—is a perversion of what I have said, which was, that Paul's manifestations were a proper point of departure, *not* for our knowledge of Christ generally and through his entire history, *but for the right understanding of appearances recorded of him after the crucifixion.* The whole of the argument which your correspondent supposes might be founded on my theory respecting the resurrection (C. R., February, 1860, p. 89) assumes the possibility of a transference of reasoning from a limited and very peculiar portion of the gospel narrative, to another and the main portion of it (the two being distinctly separated by the public death of Christ) which no sane or candid mind would ever think of making. Any theory might be put in an absurd or offensive light, by such gratuitous omission and perversion of its essential elements. The Unitarian Minister asks me, with evident self-complacency, what I could reply to such an argumentation as he has supposed. I should reply, that it did not affect me at all, because it misstated what I had said. Every link in it involves a misconception or a misrepresentation.

The same writer has quoted two passages from the Ignatian Epistles, of which I confess I cannot see the pertinence or the bearing. So far from denying, I have specially alluded to the influence of the Docetic heresy and to the *realist* reaction against it. I did not want this additional evidence of a notorious fact. By referring to the martyrdom of Ignatius in A.D. 107, I presume he intends it to be inferred, that the extracts which he has given may be accepted as a reliable indication of the conflict of Christian opinion at the close of the first century. I am surprised he should have done this. He must have known, or at least ought to have known, that these Epistles, even in their shorter form, have been so largely interpolated, and consist of portions of such various dates, that they can be used with no safety as evidence of the state of things in the age of Ignatius himself; and this uncertainty respecting them has been increased by the discovery of a still briefer form of portions of them in Syriac, recently published by Dr. Cureton.* Your correspondent has been singularly unfor-

* Learned men had been long previously divided in opinion, whether the shorter Epistles were a mutilation of the larger, or the larger an interpolation of the shorter. Whiston, guided by his Arian predilections, adopted the former

inate in selecting for extract the two Epistles to the Trallians nd the Smyrnæans. The last-mentioned scholar, the most recent nd very learned interpreter of the Ignatian literature, has infer-ed from conclusive internal evidence, that these two Epistles are om the same hand, and both spurious. From the occurrence f particular forms of expression which belong to a later date, nd from the relation between the larger and the smaller forms, e decides that they cannot have been written till long after the me of Ignatius; and if he is correct in his inference, that not ie Docetæ but the later sect of the Phantasiastæ are the parties ecially condemned in Trallians, ch. ix., they cannot have been ritten before the early part of the sixth century.* What bear-ig this citation can have on the present controversy, I leave ie reader to judge.

I think it will be admitted that, throughout this controversy, hether I am right or wrong in my particular view, I have con-antly appealed to the testimony of the apostle Paul, which we ave direct from his own pen, and which is the oldest witness iat we possess on the subject, for an explanation of the mode i which I suppose Christ to have appeared to his disciples after ie resurrection. In a matter of acknowledged difficulty and ystery, without questioning the sincerity or sobriety of those ho see it in another light, I have adopted that interpretation f a very remarkable set of phenomena which, after years of arnest reflection, presents the fewest difficulties to my own iind, and enables me most firmly to grasp and most intelligibly) realize the one only important fact of a heavenly life reserved)r man after death. My belief is—and I have uniformly main-iined—that Paul, in some mode which I do not pretend to ex-lain, had intercourse with the risen Jesus; that his knowledge f Jesus, from its marked accompaniments and effects, cannot e resolved into a mere subjective vision, but was *extra-personal* nd *supernatural*. In putting this and the other recorded appear-nces of the risen Christ into the class of *inward* facts, I have elt that I was adopting a distinction warranted by the soundest hilosophy, in which I had the sanction and example of some of he deepest scholars and closest thinkers of our day. I cannot ention a name more entitled to respect both as a scholar and a hinker than that of Mr. Jowett, of Oxford. Let it be kept in iind, that I have taken the appearances to Paul as the type of ll other equally well-attested appearances, and that I regard ll of them as equally real and supernatural. This has been the

---

iew, and others have thought he might not be wholly wrong. Cureton, follow-ng out an acute suggestion of Daillé, has rendered it probable that the interpo-lators of the larger form have omitted passages in the smaller, from perceiving that they involved anachronisms which proved a later date. According to this, the smaller form of these Epistles must have been posterior to Ignatius.

* Cureton's Corpus Ignatianum, p. 331.

course of my reasoning from beginning to end. I have put all the appearances in the same category. I have supposed them all *identical* in origin and principle; I have assumed that any objection applicable to one would tell equally against every other. It might plausibly be argued against me, that I was not warranted in so completely denying all distinction between the appearances to Paul and the appearances recorded in the evangelists; but having myself put them both distinctly, emphatically and uniformly into the same class, and this being the basis of my whole theory respecting them, no objection could be raised against the *mode* of these appearances in one case which would not logically hold in the other. If the application of the theory to the gospel instances involves absurdity and mischievous delusion, the same imputations, as the two cases are by supposition absolutely identical, cannot be warded off from the recorded case of Paul, where we have his own solemn word for the reality of the appearance of the risen Christ.

Now, how does the Unitarian Minister meet this theory? He compares it with the philosophy of "mesmerists, table-turners, clairvoyants, rappers, revivalists and others, who now arrogate and (as he thinks) degrade the name of 'Spiritualist.'" He charges me with "putting the gospel evidences on a level with the claims of the Ploughkeepsie Andrew Davis and the Wilkinsonian visions;" and adds that, were he to adopt my views, "he would drop the name Christian, as he would shun that of Mesmerist or Table-turner" (C. R., Feb., p. 91). I appeal with confidence to every fair and candid person who has taken the trouble to read through this present controversy, however unsatisfactory he may find my attempted explanation of some very mysterious phenomena, whether I have uttered one word in the course of it which logically justifies such an inference as this. Language like this, where men are engaged in a common search after the highest truth, seems to me gratuitously offensive and even irreverent. For the same philosophy which deduces such revolting consequences from a theory founded directly on the recorded experience of the apostle Paul, cannot consistently accept his own solemn declarations or believe in the reality of his personal intercourse with Christ. The inference fairly deducible, as it seems to me, from the writer's own statements—an inference which I have not sought, but which he himself invites and suggests—is that the manifestation of the risen Christ to Paul must be put into the same category with clairvoyance, table-turning and spirit-rapping. If this be not a logical deduction from his words, I ask what is?

I confess, I cannot discern any resemblance between such cases of manifestation from the unseen world, as I suppose to have occurred in the apostolic age, and as Paul in his own case distinctly attests, and the absurdities of the modern spiritualists. But even were there any resemblance at all, it would be very unfair to

argue against the reality of well-attested cases, occurring in a great crisis of intense religious faith, because fictitious imitations of them were attempted at a later period. I wonder the Unitarian Minister does not see that the argument may be turned against himself. I have no doubt that he is a sincere and rational believer in the miracles of the New Testament. But he knows perfectly well that miracles, closely resembling or rather mere imitations of these, are reported all through the subsequent ages of the Church, and on such evidence, that even so calm and judicious a writer as Jortin has admitted their reality down to the age of Constantine,* and Dr. Newman has constructed on the evidence alleged, a specious though inconclusive argument for applying a similar standard of credibility to the narratives of the New Testament and those of Ecclesiastical History.† Maury has shewn in his curious and instructive "Essai sur les Légendes Pieuses du Moyen Age," that it was the great object of saints to act over again the history of the New Testament. Everywhere, says he, we find "au milieu de ce chaos de merveilleux, les miracles de l'Evangile sans cesse reproduits, sans cesse renaissants, avec chaque nouveau saint." St. Francis d'Assisi, whose merits were recorded in the "Liber Conformitatum vitæ beati Francisci ad vitam J. C. Domini nostri," was believed in several points to have surpassed his master. Christ was transfigured only once; St. Francis twenty times. (P. 25.) The Unitarian Minister would justly complain, if in consequence of these preposterous counterfeits, he were called on to give up his faith in the beautiful and reasonable miracles ascribed to Christ in the New Testament. I see no difference between his case and mine.

The Unitarian Minister has expressed a sensitive apprehension (C. R., October, 1859) lest the theology of the *National Review* should be confounded with his own. I do indeed hope no one will hold him responsible for my heresies. I quite feel for the delicate tenderness of his Unitarian orthodoxy. I hope he is equally considerate for those who are a shade more orthodox than himself. For myself, I could heartily reciprocate the apprehension as respects some of his own views. We shall both perhaps do best to tolerate each other's idiosyncrasy and respect each other's freedom. He must not, however, too confidently take it for granted that the undivided strength of Christian conviction is all on his side of the question, or that the conservative influences of religion which are best calculated to meet the doubts and difficulties of this not irreverent but certainly sceptical age, are associated exclusively with the peculiar type of his own opinions. I have alluded in former communications to some wise and good

---

* Remarks on Ecclesiastical History.

† Essay on the Miracles of the Early Ages, originally prefixed as an Introduction to Fleury's Ecclesiastical History.

men, the devoutest of Christians, who in different ages of the Church have experienced difficulties like my own respecting the immediate subject of this controversy, and have had recourse to analogous solutions. I am not ashamed of my company. *Sit anima mea cum illis.* There is at this day a wide-spread feeling of dissatisfaction among serious men with many views traditionally current in theology, which is not to be removed by holding up before it any one form of doctrine as exclusively reasonable and true, but can only be met by all who think earnestly and feel deeply, ingenuously putting forth their deliberate convictions, in the hope that they may possibly meet the spiritual wants of a kindred nature. Thus only can a truly catholic Christianity diffuse itself in the world. Certain I am, that it will not be promoted by the self-complacent assumption of intellectual superiority and the contemptuous repudiation of all notions that may not satisfy the requirements or be suited to the taste of a particular religious school. Since the publication of the article in the *National*, which has been subjected to so much criticism, I have received expressions of sympathy, such as I did not expect, from various quarters,—some from parties wholly unknown to me,—one from a gentleman, the member, I believe, of an Unitarian church, in which he expresses his obligations to me for "sustaining him in the struggle which he and many others have, to preserve their position within the Christian fold without sacrificing their individual convictions," and "for finding in the pages" which I and some others have written on this and kindred topics, "that aid to their spiritual progress which thoughtful minds require;" and he concludes by assuring me that amidst the sharp animadversion to which we are exposed, "there are many silent, meditative minds who appreciate our labours." I should not have thought it necessary to mention this circumstance, had I not discerned occasionally something like an assumption of infallibility in the tone of the Unitarian Minister; and had I not wished him to know, that among truly religious minds there may be a wider sympathy than he suspects in the views which I have ventured to put forth, and with the effect not of detaching them from Christianity, but of drawing them into deeper communion with its spirit. It will not, I presume, be questioned, that no man ever brought a profounder and more comprehensive mind to questions of religious philosophy than Coleridge (Southey has somewhere said of him, that he possessed one of the finest intellects that God ever bestowed on a human being): nor, again, can his sincere attachment to Christianity be doubted; all his writings, every incidental breathing of his inmost soul arrested in his wonderful Table Talk, contain proofs of it. Now I happen to know at first hand from the highest authority, that in the bosom of his family and in the circle of his familiar friends, this great man made no secret of his opinion, that the evidence ordi-

narily adduced on behalf of the bodily resurrection of Christ was utterly unsatisfactory. Indeed, his language, as reported to me, was much stronger than I have here expressed.

I have, Sir, occupied a most disproportionate space in your pages. But if I had not noticed with some fulness the principal objections that have been raised against my views, I know it would have been said in certain quarters that I shrunk from the controversy and was conscious I could not maintain my positions.* It must be remembered, too, that I have had to sustain this controversy single-handed against four or five opponents. I thank you cordially for the fair and honourable way in which you have allowed a controversy to be carried on in your pages, in which I sincerely regret that my honest and deliberate convictions should be so much at variance with your own. The feeling which first led me to the view which I have here maintained of a momentous subject, and which still binds me to it, was the earnest wish to grasp the fact of a future being as a *reality*. I have now reached a time of life when the sorrows and losses which years inevitably bring with them, leave me with little solicitude as to the judgment of others on the issue of this controversy, and fill my mind with one only desire—to embrace with entire conviction in the form in which I am best able to receive it, unembarrassed by the difficulties which an artificial theology has thrown around it, the blessed trust in which alone a man can nobly live and joyfully die. I claim the liberty of interpreting certain phenomena of the gospel history in the way most satisfactory to my own mind, and perfectly compatible with the profoundest reverence for Christ, and entire belief in the reality of his resurrection,—without thereby forfeiting my place within the wide limits of the Christian fold. I think everything that I have written must shew how deeply I love Christ and Christianity. I do not wish or expect all men to see things

---

* In referring (C. R., February, 1860) to a similar discussion some years ago (C. R., 1857), the Unitarian Minister is pleased to remark, that some hints were then thrown out by me respecting a bond of Christian union which were "declared (if he must not say shewn) to be impracticable except so far as already in practice, and that the spiritual resurrection theory was critically called in question, but without evoking any reply whatever from" its author.—I ask, what is intended by this insinuation? If the writer means, that I was afraid of controversy and wished to evade it, I beg to inform him that he is mistaken. I was meditating and had commenced a reply, and, I believe, had announced it to the Editor of the C. R. The MS. of the unfinished article is still lying in my drawer. But it was a time of great excitement about College affairs; and at the earnest request of a venerated friend, to whose judgment I am always inclined to bow, I postponed the discussion to a more tranquil time. How far my views respecting Church union were generally considered practicable or not, it is not for me to say. I remember well receiving thanks from various quarters in public and in private for having opened the question as I did, with the expression of no inconsiderable sympathy.

[*Our correspondent is quite correct in his recollection of his having intimated his intention of sending a reply on the occasion referred to.*—Ed. C. R.]

as I do. If they can interpret the same phenomena, with the result of a stronger faith, in another way, I unfeignedly rejoice. If I could, I would not weaken their conviction, unless I was certain of putting something stronger and more consolatory in its place. Each must live by his own faith. This is all I argue for; and this, as I understand it, is the spirit of Paul and Christ. If what I have written, and others have written in reply to me, shall have made us all feel more deeply the truth of this great principle, and have the effect of widening the bonds of Christian communion and of strengthening the respect for each other's spiritual freedom, this controversy, painful as in some respects it has been to me, will not have passed without leaving some valuable fruit behind it.

THE AUTHOR OF THE ARTICLE ON EWALD'S APOSTOLIC AGE IN THE NATIONAL REVIEW.

LIFE AND LETTERS OF SCHLEIERMACHER.*

THE second volume of this work introduces Schleiermacher to us in his position of Professor extraordinary in the university of Halle,—an office upon which he entered, by the nomination of his own government, in 1804. He had previously been invited to a similar place in the university of Würzburg, but the Prussian government, wishing to retain him nearer home, had declined to give him the necessary permission to transfer his now well-appreciated talents into the service of another state. Of Schleiermacher as he was at Halle, a very interesting account is afforded by a passage taken from the *Memoirs of H. Steffens*, who was Professor of Natural Philosophy in the same university, and an intimate friend of the theologian. Steffens writes:

"I was there to meet a man whose acquaintance was destined to form an epoch in my life. This was Schleiermacher, who was at the same time as myself, or a few weeks later, called to Halle as *professor extraordinarius*. Schleiermacher, as is well known, was small of stature and slightly deformed, but so slightly as hardly to be disfigured by it. His movements were quick and animated, his features highly expressive. A certain sharpness in his eye acted, perhaps, repulsively at times. He seemed, indeed, to look through every one. He was a few years older than myself. His face was long, his features sharply defined, his lips firmly and severely closed, his chin prominent, his eyes lively and full of fire, his look always earnest, collected, and self-possessed. I saw him under various circumstances in life—deeply meditative and sportive, mild and fired with anger, moved by joy and sorrow—but ever an unalterable composure, greater, mightier than every passing emotion,

* Continued from p. 164.

seemed to dominate his being. A slight expression of irony played round his features; the sincerest sympathy ever animated his heart; and an almost childlike goodness shone through the outward calm. His constant presence of mind had sharpened his senses in a most remarkable degree. Even while engaged in the most animated conversation, nothing escaped him. He saw everything that was passing around him, and heard everything, even the most low-toned conversation. . . . We attached ourselves at once and unconditionally to each other. . . . . His lectures on ethics, and mine on natural philosophy, seemed to our hearers to be intimately connected, and to supplement each other. We mutually communicated to each other what we knew; and if Schleiermacher profited by my lectures on physics, he, in return, opened up to me Greek philosophy, and through him I became acquainted with Plato."—II. 2—4.

The letters to the Willichs occupy by far the largest space at this period. Beautiful and noble letters many of them are, full of wise remarks on life and character, and everywhere revealing the characteristics of a pure, devout and affectionate mind. Those of the Willichs, especially those of Henrietta, have many of the same features; and we cannot wonder that a friendship so warm and complete towards this young couple should have resulted eventually, after the death of Ehrenfried von Willich, in the young widow becoming the wife of Schleiermacher. Here is a specimen, taken almost at random, from one of these letters, in which Schleiermacher warns his friends against isolating themselves in the selfish enjoyment of their own domestic life:

"You must not begin with isolating yourselves. Though you may suffice for each other, that is not enough. Every family, and more especially such a family as you constitute, must from the beginning adopt the missionary spirit, and be on the look-out for some soul that it may draw towards itself and save from the desolate waste of life.

"I always think of a family as a pretty snug little room in the great palace of God, as a sweet, contemplative resting-place in His garden, whence the whole may be overlooked; but also as a snuggery in which one may bury oneself deeply, and feel around one its narrow, cozy limits. In such, the doors must not be closed, but every one must be admitted who possesses the magic key, or who knows how to find his way in by bending aside the branches that conceal the entrance. Is there nobody in your neighbourhood, who might be inclined to knock at your door and to participate a little in your life? You can hardly conceive how impatient I am to see everything connected with you develop itself; and I should, therefore, like to know that you are already letting your light shine before others. It always seems to me one of the great privileges of a clergyman, that, being entitled by his office to lead a retired life, he may keep aloof from burdensome conventional connections, while, on the other hand, his calling points out to him the true nurslings and friends of his household, whom he ought to lead by his example to undeviating morality, and to a simple, rational enjoyment of life. How heartily have I not rejoiced with you, my Ehrenfried, that your office is of this blessed kind."—II. 8, 9.

And here is a passage from a letter of the "dear, sweet daughter" to her "dear father," in which is disclosed something of the grave and elevated, yet bright and cheerful, nature which fitted her to be the friend and wife of such a man. The English might in this case have run a little more smoothly:

"It is only to-day that I am writing to you in reality, but in the long interval my spirit has often been with you, and answered your dear letters; and it so happens that I am able to write to you on my much-loved Sunday morning. From my earliest youth Sunday morning was always very precious to me. While I was at school in Greifswald, this was the only morning I had to myself, and on which I could prosecute my favourite occupations. I always kept it very quietly and unobtrusively. I was generally alone in the school-room, where I could hear the tones of the organ and of the human voices from the church close by. Among the many books around me, I had selected a few in which I read on these occasions—mostly old devotional works. I cannot describe to you what my feelings were; how inexpressibly happy, and yet how sad, and how much those hours of quiet devotion elevated my being, and inspired me with an earnestness that followed me through the bustle of the whole ensuing week. Now I feel what those hours were to me; they appear to have been the preparation for my present life. At present, I often go to church with Ehrenfried on the Sunday, and afterwards we talk over the sermon, and I tell him what touched me most, and he tells me in his turn with which parts he was satisfied, and with which not—and this is like a second service to us."—II. 11, 12.

Schleiermacher's letters of this period contain various allusions to his new position—his lectures—his sermons—the students—and last, though not least, his still cherished affection for Eleanore Grunow, of which he speaks freely to the Willichs. At one time he even hopes to bring her with him to visit them as his wife; but this delusion is soon to end. She breaks off the intercourse; a result of which he writes to his friends, "it is the deepest, most crushing, sorrow—the pain will never leave me—the unity of my life is rent asunder; but" (he manfully adds) "whatever can be made of the ruins I will make of them." Strange infatuation it seems to the distant spectator; and little did either "father" or "daughter" suspect the hidden import of what had now taken place to the future lives of both of them.

These private interests are soon to be overshadowed by political events of the gravest importance, amidst which Schleiermacher's personal position becomes one of great embarrassment and even danger. The year 1806 saw Prussia overrun by the French armies, an immediate consequence of the catastrophe of Jena. Halle, from its situation, could not escape. The spirit of the students especially attracted Napoleon's notice, leading to their own dispersion and the dissolution of the university. Schleiermacher's church is first taken for a corn magazine, and then, later, entirely destroyed. He is left for a time almost without the means of subsistence. In this state of things his courage

and hopefulness remain unbroken. He looks upon the war, as did most of his countrymen, as the only means of deliverance from the hated oppression of the French; and when the worst has come, he will not desert his king and fatherland, even though a desirable situation is repeatedly urged upon him at Bremen:

"I have again received a call to Bremen; but I have determined to decline it, because I will remain faithful to Halle as long as there is the slightest hope of the maintenance of the university. Should the king be obliged to conclude an unfavourable peace, and should he retain Halle, though his territories were otherwise greatly reduced, there will be numbers who will prefer leaving to staying, and I will not be among those who set so bad an example. But should the war be protracted, as I hope, I will seek a provisional appointment somewhere else in Prussia, so that I may be at hand immediately when things change. For the influence that an academical teacher may have upon the young generation seems to me more than ever of the highest importance. We must sow seeds, which may not perhaps sprout for a long while, but which will, in consequence, require to be all the more carefully treated and tended. Dear friend, were I to describe to you the utter desolation of my heart when I think of the loss of my pulpit and of my professorial chair, and when it sometimes comes home to me that, after all, my sphere of activity may never be reconstituted, you would hardly be able to understand me. When, however, I look further, and take a more comprehensive view of matters, I become calm again. The constitution of Germany had become untenable; in the Prussian monarchy there was also a great deal that had become superannuated and that was merely patched together: this has been destroyed. The manner in which the kernel shall save itself from similar destruction will prove whether it be sound or not. I feel certain that Germany, the kernel of Europe, will stand forth again in a new and beautiful form; but when this will take place, and whether the country will not first have to pass through still greater troubles, and to bend for a long time under a heavy yoke, God alone knows. I have no fear, except, sometimes, of a dishonourable peace, which may save the appearance—but only the appearance—of a national existence and freedom."—II. 72, 73.

The following relates to the French pillage of Halle, and may both give us some idea of the character of such scenes, as reported by an intelligent and courageous eye-witness, and also shew us the indomitable and cheerful spirit with which the tender-hearted professor faced his own difficulties:

"The pillage was, indeed, bad enough, yet not so bad as one generally fancies. Immediately after the engagement, the imprudence of the people who live below, enabled several hussars to penetrate into the house and upstairs into our rooms. Steffens and Gass were just with me; we were all three obliged to give up our watches, and Gass his money; Steffens was already drained, and in my possession they only found a few dollars; but all my shirts, with the exception of five, and all the silver spoons, with the exception of two, they carried off. During the engagement, we were very near getting into danger. Steffens came in the morning to invite us to come to his house, if we wished to

witness a fight. From thence we saw the attack upon the bridge very distinctly; but when I perceived that the Prussian cannon were being dismounted, and that the position was about to be lost, I persuaded Steffens to go home with me, as his house was very much exposed. We hastened as much as possible; but Hannah and I had not yet reached my street, when we heard shots behind us in the town, and Steffens, who was in the rear with his child in his arms, had very nearly got hemmed in between the crowd of retiring Prussians and pursuing Frenchmen.

"The following days I had a fearful number of soldiers billeted upon me, and the proprietors of our house, poor orphans under the guardianship of a couple of old aunts, had nothing in their pockets, so that I felt very much afraid lest the brutality of the people should be roused, and we all spent a very uncomfortable night in Konopak's room. Subsequently we had officers and privates of the guards quartered in the house, and during two nights I was obliged to admit a secretary of the staff and two other *employés* into my large sitting-room, as there was no place for them down-stairs. The officers who had their quarters there frightened the poor people with all kinds of rumours of the town being given up to plunder and to fire, and made us spend a very tragi-comical night. But the preceding evening a storm, almost as bad as this, had in reality broken out—I mean the order for the dispersion of the students. Allow me to give you an explanation of what this means from the economical point of view, in order that you may form a conception of our position. . . . . If peace be soon concluded, it is not at all probable that Halle will remain Prussian. Should it be handed over to Saxony, perhaps the university will be dissolved, or, at all events, there will be an end to my stay in it, as the Saxons are such very strict Lutherans. If the town fall to the share of a French prince, I, for my part, will not abide in it, as long as there is anywhere a Prussian hole to which I can retire. . . .

"Be not angry with me for troubling you so much about *œconomicis*. Unfortunately it is necessary to take these wretched matters into very serious consideration. For the rest, I am working as industriously at *Plato* as anxiety about public matters as well as my own private concerns will allow."—II. 64, 65.

The full extent of his troubles does not appear even in this letter. He and his friends can gain no certain news, but only rumours of new disasters; scarcity and dearness prevail everywhere; he has no money but what he can borrow; his health suffers for want of his usual allowance of wine, and from the almost exclusively vegetable diet; and he is almost perishing with cold for want of fuel. Still he will work on at his *Plato*, and thanks God that he is called occasionally to preach for a friend, and so enabled to speak a word of comfort to the downcast people,—a noble spectacle, truly, of a good and brave man struggling with adversity!

Close upon these bitter experiences follows the news of the death of his much-loved Ehrenfried von Willich, which is communicated to Schleiermacher by Henrietta herself, then only eighteen years old, in a letter—one of the most remarkable in

the collection—of which we must quote a portion; adding only the prefatory wish that the translator, both here and in other places, had not so readily confounded *shall* and *will*, and their kindred forms:

"Schleier! dear Schleier! my beloved friend! my father! Oh, my God! my God! how shall I tell it to you, and how shall you be able to bear it! Schleier, I am no more the happy Jette, whose pure felicity you bore in your heart, and at which you so tenderly rejoiced. My dear Schleier, prepare yourself to hear the worst; the happy Jette is now a poor, sorrowing, lonely, weeping Jette. Oh, my Schleier! let me then at once give utterance to the dreadful word. My Ehrenfried—my deeply, tenderly beloved Ehrenfried—is with me no more; he lives in another world. Oh, Schleier! can you realize it? Can you conceive that I have survived it? . . . . . Schleier, I will bear this life as long as nature wills it, for I must exert myself for his and my children; but, O God! with what longing, with what a presentiment of indescribable rapture, I look forward to the world in which he lives! What happiness would it not be to me to die! Schleier, shall I not find him again? Oh, my God! I implore you, by all that you love and hold sacred, if you can, give me the certainty that I shall find him again—that I shall recognize him! Tell me your innermost belief in regard to this, dear Schleier. Alas! it will be annihilation to me to lose this faith. In this I live; through this I bear with resignation and serenity; it is the only thing I look forward to, the only hope that sheds a faint glimmer of light on my darkened existence—to meet him again, to live again for him, to make him happy. O God! it is not possible; it cannot be destroyed, it is only interrupted. I can never again be happy without him. Oh, Schleier! speak to my poor heart; tell me what you believe."—II. 77, 78.

We cannot withhold the reply to this—a noble expression, as it is, both of his friendly feelings and of the peculiar form of his faith in the future life:

"My poor, dear child! Could I but press thee, poor mourner, to my heart, we would mingle our tears; for I also am shedding bitter, scalding tears! Oh, to see so sweet a happiness destroyed! You know how my heart exulted in it. But you set me such a beautiful example. Your grief is so pure and so holy; there is nought in it that your father could wish otherwise. Let us, therefore, count it among the noblest possessions of our lives, and love it as we loved the dear departed, and submit tranquilly, though sorrowfully, to God's eternal order of things. But you appeal to me to settle your doubts. It is, however, only the images of your painfully travailing imagination, which you wish me to confirm. Dear Jette, what can I say to you? Certainty beyond this life is not given to us. Do not misunderstand me. I mean certainty for phantasy, which desires to see everything in distinct images; but, otherwise, there is the greatest certainty—and nothing would be certain if it were not so—that for the soul there is no such thing as death, no annihilation. But personal life is not the essence of spiritual being; it is but an outward presentment thereof. How this is repeated we know not—we can form no conception of it; we can only form poetic visions. . . .

"But if your imagination suggest to you a merging in the great all; let not this, dear child, fill you with bitter, poignant anguish. Do not conceive of it as a lifeless, but as a living commingling—as the highest life. Is not the ideal towards which we are all striving even in this world, though we never reach it—the merging of the life of each in the life of all, and the putting away from us every semblance of a separate existence? If then he lives in God, and you love him eternally in God, as you knew God and loved God in him, can you conceive of anything more glorious or more delightful? Is it not the highest goal which love can reach, compared with which every feeling that clings to the personal life, and springs from that alone, is as nothing."—II. 80, 81.

She is evidently little satisfied with this answer to her desire of certainty in regard to the future, or with the suggestion of the possible loss of all personal consciousness. With true Christian and womanly instinct she clings especially to the latter, and finds her chief strength and solace only in the hope of rejoining her lost Ehrenfried, and of being still remembered by him, in the better state.

The interest which Schleiermacher takes in the young widow and her two infant children is ever most beautifully expressive of the inner nature of the man. The natural result is that, after a year and a half, during a visit which he paid to Rügen, where Henrietta was residing, they were betrothed. From this point onward, from August 1808 until April 1809, many letters pass between the two. These are given under the title of "Love Letters" in the volume before us, and are as remarkable a collection, we suppose, of the kind as the reader will often meet with. We cannot but think that many of them might have been spared, though all are characteristic, and many of them are interesting and beautiful in a high degree,—mainly, however, as expressions of sentiment, combined with remarks on the new prospects and means of happiness opened out to the writers. But, surely, it is laying the heart of a man too bare to the world's eye to publish such letters as these. We should infer, moreover, from the character of his mind, that the same would have been the judgment of Schleiermacher himself.

It must be owned that the theological professor of forty and more plays the part of lover to the young widow of nineteen in an exemplary manner. Yet everywhere it is affecting to see how the memory of the lost Ehrenfried seems, for both, to throw a tender sanctity over the intended union. He is often mentioned in the letters in the most affectionate terms; while his two children are from the first adopted by Schleiermacher in the heartiest manner. The latter constantly speaks of his love for them too, and looks forward with quite as much interest to being their "father," and to the share which he will have in their education, as to becoming their mother's husband.

We might quote many passages in illustration of the thoroughly

happy relations now established between Schleiermacher and his "Jette,"—shewing, for example, how impatient he is for her letters, looking upon the intervals between them as each a "little eternity;" how he "counts the Mondays" since that one on which he entered upon a new life; and recalls the happy moment when she placed her hand in his, and he led her "out of the summer-house and along the path that day;" with much more to the same effect. In one place he tells her to find out his faults from Henrietta Herz, and to reflect that she will have to bear them all. In reply, she only laughs, or rather says that she and the other "Jette" have both laughed over their discussion of "his odious qualities." To make up for this, she anticipates, with natural eagerness, the delights of her new life in Berlin, especially the glory of being "the wife of a celebrated man," to say nothing of the concerts and operas "and other such things." She will "dust his books," and try to be a good housekeeper, and not "forget" anything more than once a week. Moreover, she is to be a pattern of a preacher's wife in regard to the sermons. She is not always to go to *his* church, but sometimes to hear others, that she may be able to compare him with them, and help him to judge of the impression made by his own preaching. He is apt to think that he has only done badly when nothing is said to him on the subject. However, when she is come, he will never do that; "for," as he gallantly adds, "you will always inspire me in some way, and the increased happiness of my life will not fail to make my sermons more animated."

But higher topics than these form the main substance of these Letters. We quote the following, for the sake of both the question and the answer. She is doubtful on a point in her religious experience:

"It is whether I am wrong in calling those feelings religious which are awakened in me by the music in church? For I must confess that I feel quite differently when the service is not accompanied by music. I cannot describe to you how my soul is borne aloft, as it were, by the tones; what a feeling of freedom is developed in me, what a consciousness of the holy and the infinite seems to pervade me. That oppressive weight, of which I lately complained to you, and which I told you made me feel as if my physical being held the spiritual in bondage, and prevented it from pouring itself out in tears and sentiments—that weight seems to be gently lifted off, and my soul moves in unrestrained freedom. . . . . But tell me, my Ernst, is it in accordance with pure Christian feeling, that anything *external* should produce such a powerful religious effect on me—that I require an *external* agency to enable me to lose myself in God?"—II. 150, 151.

The wise and beautiful reply is worthy of Schleiermacher. Speaking of a certain picture, he says,

"The picture inspired me with earnest and devotional feeling; and as this made me think of what you wrote to me about the vivifying

effect of art on the religious sentiment, you were brought very vividly before my mind. Dearest, be not over anxious, and do not try to separate what God himself has intimately united. Religion and art belong together as soul and body. When your inward feelings are strongly moved and seek an outward expression, they, no doubt, pour themselves out in song, in consequence of your natural talent for music; and so also in the church, music and singing are the common bond between, and the proof of the emotions stirring in, all, and this community of feeling again heightens the emotions of each individual. I should be quite sorry if you were indifferent to the music and the singing in the church, and if you believed that the same feelings could be awakened without their help. The organ, more especially, is an invention that entirely belongs to Christianity; so much so, indeed, that it is hardly used for any other service. . . . . It is true that through art, feelings may even be awakened in such persons as are not in the least pious, and which they are, nevertheless, deceived into believing truly devotional; but the heightened feeling with which they inspire the pious, is, no doubt, really religious. To those who are receptive for their influences, there must be something truly divine in them; for it is the innermost living spirit of nature that speaks through them."—II. 157, 158.

If we have dwelt too largely on this part of Schleiermacher's life, we can plead in excuse that we have only kept closely to our text. Nearly a third of this volume is occupied with the "Love Letters," the close of which brings us of course to the period of his marriage, in May, 1809. The preceding months have not been without their anxieties, in regard to outward circumstances and the means of future support. On one occasion Schleiermacher is summoned before the French Marshal in Berlin, and cautioned not to be too free in his sermons on the state of political affairs. The establishment of the Berlin university remains long an uncertainty, owing to the position of the Prussian government. This uncertainty places him for the time "in a great economical predicament." But yet he resolves (as people usually do in such cases) that "neither economical nor political difficulties" shall make him defer their union "even a day," and he is sure that she will be as confident as himself that the necessaries of life (*necessities*, the translator has it) will not fail them: another, we fear, to be added to the long list of imprudent marriages, from which all the genius and philosophy even of a Schleiermacher proved no effectual safeguard.

We have thus far quoted too freely to be able to pursue the remainder of Schleiermacher's career at proportionate length. During a period of five-and-twenty years, his position in Berlin, as a professor in the university and a preacher in one of the principal churches, is one of great labour and yearly increasing celebrity. Of course his own letters do not tell us much either of his fame as a teacher or of his popularity in the pulpit; but we do learn from them the great happiness which attended his union with Henrietta von Willich. Schleiermacher himself had but

one son, who died in childhood; but his fatherly regard for the little Willichs does not diminish; and, besides them, his family circle included the child of a deceased sister and one of a friend, —all four being, we are told, "cherished and educated by him as his own." Of his social disposition and his peculiar talent as a preacher, one or two very interesting statements are given. The first is taken from a work by Henrietta Herz:

"His social relations were very numerous, and took up a great deal of his time, and perhaps, indeed, were chiefly the cause of his not having had leisure during his lifetime to prepare his lectures for publication. It is true that he had the power of working at any time, his mind being always sufficiently collected for the purpose; but for this very reason he was ever inclined to think that he should be able to accomplish more than proved actually to be the case. He very rarely refused an invitation, and also saw a great deal of company at his own house; but frequently after the most luxurious and hilarious dinner-party or supper-party, he would sit down to his writing-table, in a moment be absorbed in the deepest speculations, and work far into the night. When it so happened that he had to preach the next day, and his drawing-room was full of company, he would draw aside for about a quarter of an hour, taking up his stand close to the stove, and looking thoughtfully straight before him. His more intimate friends were aware that at such moments he was reflecting on his sermon, and took care that he should not be disturbed. In a short while he was again a lively participator in the conversation going on; but in the interval he had jotted down a few notes with pencil on a slip of paper, and this was all that was ever written of his sermons before they were preached; yet I have frequently heard him the next morning, after a preparation seemingly so insufficient, deliver the most deeply-reflected and deeply-felt discourse."—II. 198, 199.

Another passage, quoted from Lücke, gives us a more graphic account of his delivery and appearance in the pulpit:

"It is well known that Schleiermacher never wrote his sermons before delivering them. All those that have been published were taken down during delivery. While I was a constant hearer of his, two young friends were always engaged in this work. Those persons who were aware of this felt higher admiration for the great gifts of the man. The sermon could not be said to have come into existence in the pulpit, in as far as it was generally conceived in his mind several days previously, and left as it were to mature there until the moment of delivery. But no part of it was committed to paper while I lived with him, except the text and the theme, which was noted down on Saturday evening, and at the most, in addition to this, the heads of the divisions of the latter. This he called writing his slip, and thus prepared he entered the pulpit. Here the sermon took definite form, the mode of representation and the detailed execution being the living product, not only of the preceding reflection, but also of the animating impression produced by the assembled congregation, and of the never-failing power of his mind over the order of his thoughts, and his equally unfailing command of language. Those who knew the secret could follow the growth

of the artistic structure of his discourse. They perceived how, at first, he spoke slowly and deliberately, somewhat in the ordinary tone of conversation, as if gathering and marshalling his thoughts; then, after awhile, when he had, as it were, spread out and again drawn together the entire net of his thoughts, his words flowed faster, the discourse became more animated, and the nearer he drew towards the encouraging or admonishing peroration, the fuller and the richer flowed the stream. He was ever the same and always equally attractive by the original manner in which he treated his text, by the novelty and freshness of his thoughts, by the order and clearness of his mode of representation, and the fluency of his delivery."—II. 199, 200.

There is more to the same effect, tending to awaken the strongest admiration of the great powers of this excellent man. At no period can these have been more finely or effectually exercised than during the excitement of the war of liberation, 1813-14, when, as he says, he could at least employ "the telling battery of words," and from the altar call the people to battle, "to share in the life and death struggle." His sermon to the students about to march, as volunteers, for the scene of war, their arms piled up in front and against the walls of the church, which within was filled to overflowing, must have been one of the finest scenes of the kind anywhere recorded. An eye-witness of it says,—

"Speaking from his heart with pious enthusiasm, his every word penetrated to the heart, and the clear, full, mighty stream of his eloquence carried every one along with it. His bold, frank declaration of the causes of our deep fall, his severe denunciation of our actual defects, as evinced in the narrow-hearted spirit of caste, of proud aristocratism, and in the dead forms of bureaucratism, struck down like thunder and lightning, and the subsequent elevation of the heart to God on the wings of solemn devotion, was like harp-tones from a higher world. The discourse proceeded in an uninterrupted stream, and every word was *from* the times and *for* the times. And when, at last, with the full fire of enthusiasm, he addressed the noble youths already equipped for battle, and next turning to their mothers, the greater number of whom were present, he concluded with the words: 'Blessed is the womb that has borne such a son, blessed the breast that has nourished such a babe,'—a thrill of deep emotion ran through the assembly, and amid loud sobs and weeping, Schleiermacher pronounced the conclusive Amen."—II. 203, 204.

It may have been gathered from the latter part of this paper that our interest in this work has by no means lessened as we have proceeded with its perusal. The contrary has been the case. Of Schleiermacher's religious philosophy, or of his literary labours and their results, little or nothing, as we have before intimated, can be learnt from these pages; but "the man Schleiermacher," as he was in his personal character and relations, is evidently very faithfully set before us. We lay down the book with no slight feeling of satisfaction at having been enabled by

its means to gain so near and familiar an acquaintance with one of the excellent of the earth,—a man whose simple, faithful, laborious, honourable life, taken "for all and all," and judged according to its own appointed place and work, need not, we are sure, be withheld from the comparison, by some suggested, with that even of the most learned or "practical" or well-paid of English bishops, whether at home or in the colonies.

THE LATE DR. HUTTON.

THE late Dr. HUTTON was sensitively averse to biographical commemoration, especially when it took the form of undiscriminate eulogy. He was constantly in the habit of quoting with entire approval a passage from Carlyle's Life of Sterling: "How happy it comparatively is for a man of any earnestness of life to have no biography written of him; but to return silently, with his small, sorely-foiled bit of work, to the Supreme Silences who can alone judge of it or of him!" Had his own wishes been consulted, he would probably have desired that not a word should be written of him for the general public, but that his memory should live and die with those who knew and loved him. This, however, is one of those cases in which personal feelings must in some degree give way to a sense of what is due to the reasonable demands of others. Numbers, we are sure, would have felt that a wrong had been done to themselves, if so good a man and faithful a minister of Christ had been allowed to pass away from the midst of us without any memorial. Out of deference, however, to his expressed sentiments on this subject, we shall studiously make our narrative simple and brief, and attempt nothing but a truthful record of the impression which his character and life have left deeply graven on our own mind.

The family to which Dr. Hutton belonged had been settled in Ireland for two hundred years. Their common ancestor, it is believed, went over in the time of Cromwell and received a grant of confiscated land in the north of the island. A branch of the family, two or three generations ago, settled in Dublin, where the father of the subject of this memoir, the late Rev. Joseph Hutton, was for many years one of the pastors of the Eustace-Street Presbyterian congregation, occupying the same pulpit which had been filled about the middle of the last century by the learned Dr. Leland, author of the "View of Deistical Writers" and other well-known works. This venerable man died in 1856, only a few years before his son, at the advanced age of ninety. The mother of Dr. Hutton was a Swanwick, one of the wide-spread descendants of Philip Henry; so that

through both his parents he inherited the old Puritan blood. This lady still lives in the enjoyment of her faculties, having nearly completed her ninety-third year and survived ten of her children.

Dr. Hutton was born in Dublin on the 11th of June, 1790. He received the first part of his education in his father's school, and then entered Trinity College, Dublin, where Dr. Meredith was for some time his tutor, and where he finally took his Bachelor's degree. From the same learned body he afterwards obtained the degree of LL.D. About 1811, he went to the University of Glasgow, and studied Moral Philosophy under the late Professor Mylne. He remained only one session at Glasgow; but he always spoke of the instruction which he there enjoyed, as having contributed in an eminent degree to open his mind and give him the command of his faculties. From Glasgow he removed to York, where he continued three sessions. Here he had for his fellow-students, Mr. Geo. Kenrick, Mr. W. Hincks, at present a Professor in the University of Toronto, and the two excellent brothers, William and Henry Turner, both now deceased, with the latter of whom he formed a tender and intimate friendship that was only broken off by his premature death. His obligations to his beloved and honoured Theological Tutor, the late Rev. Charles Wellbeloved, he never ceased to acknowledge with affectionate gratitude. In October, 1813, he entered on his first ministry as assistant to the Rev. James Tayler, pastor of the High-Pavement congregation, Nottingham, to whom through life he was affectionately attached, almost as a son to a father. Nottingham was always dear to him. From the years spent there he dated many of his enduring friendships and happiest remembrances. Wherever he was placed, he was a man to love and to be loved. Early in 1817, he succeeded the Rev. E. Cogan as sole pastor of the congregation at Walthamstow; and ever afterwards reckoned the friendship of that distinguished scholar and simple-hearted man as one of the blessings and privileges of his life. In the same year he married Susannah, eldest daughter of John and Rachel Holt, who were then resident in Nottingham. His stay at Walthamstow was brief. In the early part of 1818, he accepted an invitation to become the minister of Mill-Hill chapel, Leeds. He preached his first sermon there on the first Sunday of May in that year. At Leeds he continued seventeen years, which he always looked back upon with unaltered affection, as on the whole perhaps the happiest period of his life. With a view to superior advantages for the education of his children, in 1835 he removed to London, and on the first Sunday in May opened his ministry in Carter Lane. By a singular coincidence, his ministry in London and in Leeds began on the first Sunday of the same month, and lasted the same number of years. In *London,* as everywhere else, he added largely to his number of

devoted friends. For a part of 1852 he had no stated pulpit, but preached constantly for his brother ministers. In the autumn of that year he accepted his last ministerial call, and preached his first sermon at Derby on the 3rd of October. At Derby he remained, in the regular discharge of his pastoral duties, interrupted only by occasional journeys, and in the quiet enjoyment of his books and friends, till his death. He preached his last sermons on the 18th of March, 1860, with his usual earnestness and animation. On Thursday, the 22nd of that month, he was suddenly taken ill, and after a short period of very acute suffering, passed to his rest on Wednesday, the 28th. He had then nearly reached the age of seventy, and was contemplating a final retirement from the ministry before the close of the year. On the last day of March, his mortal remains were deposited in the cemetery near Derby.

This is a bare outline of external facts, of little value but to those who can fill it up with their vivid remembrances of the living man. Those who knew him only by general reputation as an honoured minister of the Unitarian faith, will naturally ask with some interest, what were the qualities of head and heart which so endeared him to his personal friends, and have left behind them so delightful a remembrance. A few days after his death, a friend who had known him from early youth and loved him tenderly, wrote of him in the following terms; and as these words have at least the merit, which is alone important on such occasions, of simple faithfulness, it may be as well to give them just as they flowed from the pen under the fresh sense of recent bereavement.

"We have lost perhaps as pure and loving, as unselfish and unworldly, a spirit as our inevitable infirmity ever permitted to dwell in a human breast. The memory of our dear departed friend is the memory of a truly good and religious man—of one in whose childlike simplicity of heart, habitual rectitude of aim, and guileless benevolence of spirit, all who knew him could not but implicitly trust. Christianity was with him a principle, not a profession only. You saw, on conversing with him, that he sincerely believed it, and on observing his character, that it was his earnest endeavour to act out its spirit in his temper and his life. I should render him, however, very inadequate justice, if I left it to be inferred from this remark, that he was distinguished for moral and religious excellence alone. He had fine intellectual gifts richly cultivated, but they were overshadowed by the predominance of the qualities of his heart; they were often checked from even a legitimate display by the extreme sensibility of his conscience—by that abhorrence of every approach to false pretence and that entire freedom from ambition, which made him less known to the world, but only endeared him the more to those who were admitted into his privacy, and saw what

rare and beautiful endowments it concealed. Like many superior men who had been educated and had contracted their intellectual bias in the last generation, he had no particular relish or perhaps aptitude for the historical and archæological studies, the refined critical researches, and the higher scientific pursuits, which have come into vogue within the last five-and-twenty or thirty years, and are now leading objects of the intellectual activity of the age. On the other hand, in all questions of speculative ethics, of theology, and of mental and religious philosophy, he retained to the last an unabated interest; and in discussing them he gave continual evidence of a fine metaphysical discrimination, a power of analysis, and a blended keenness and delicacy of argumentation, which might have raised him to eminence in this department of inquiry, had he made it a subject of close and continuous attention. A marked feature of his mind, intimately connected with his deep sensibility, was his taste, which was at once refined and susceptible. Of beauty, in all its forms, he had an exquisite sense. Poetry, fiction, the higher productions of art, every genuine expression of humour when unmixed with coarseness or malignity, natural scenery, the free and courteous interchange of thought and sentiment in the social circle, were to him sources of the purest delight. He forgot himself in the enjoyment of them. It was never marred by the egotistic wish to shine; it was for him happiness enough in and for itself; you saw the reflection of it in his beaming countenance, in the mingled smiles and tears which shone so constantly in his eyes. He wrote with difficulty, for in composition he was fastidious to a fault. The refined graces of his style were lost except on minds that were tempered like his own. For the mass of men, a mode of address bolder and freer, even coarser, would have proved more effective. This peculiarity in his discourses, combined with the overpowering tenderness of his sensibility, prevented his taking that rank among preachers, to which the elevation of his thoughts, the beauty of his sentiments, the fervour of his devotion, and the flowing gracefulness of his diction, would otherwise have entitled him.

"The very deficiencies which the application of a severer standard of judgment might possibly detect in his character, were closely allied to the goodness and purity of his nature. If a little more steadiness and continuity of exertion in one direction would certainly have enabled him to produce a stronger impression on society both as a writer and as a preacher, yet the absence of this impulse kept him at least simple, genuine and unambitious. If sometimes one could not but regret, that his fondness for the amenities of literature detained him too much from the drier and severer studies which are the price that must be paid for thorough scholarship and an effectual mastery of the great *questions* of the day, yet it must not be forgotten, how indifferent

he was in this remission of sterner effort to all self-exaltation—how his innocent and sympathizing spirit in its most vagrant excursions extracted sweetness, some element of wisdom or beauty, from the humblest flowret of literature that blossomed in his path. If he gave his time too freely to all claimants, and did not always guard sufficiently the sanctity of his study against needless intrusion, it was the mistake of one with whom the heart was ever more precious than the head, and who neglected, perhaps inconsiderately, the opportunities of personal improvement from too great readiness to share the feelings and participate in the interests and contribute to the innocent happiness of others. In looking back on our departed friend's career in life, we cannot wholly suppress the thought, that if he had only had a little more of prudent and justifiable regard to self, if he had not been so entirely insensible to all worldly ambition, he might have furnished proofs of powers and accomplishments that must now, except to a few chosen friends, remain for ever unknown, and have left an impression on the moral and spiritual condition of his time which cannot henceforth be publicly associated with his name; and from that thought a regret is inseparable, that one whom we so honoured and loved, and whose beautiful gifts of mind and heart we so highly prized, should not have been appreciated at his full worth through a wider sphere, nor have won for himself a distinction in the world which there was so much in him to deserve.

"Yet there is another side even to this consideration. Who ever shed gentler and holier influences on the circles in which he moved? Whose presence ever brought more gladness and comfort into the Christian home? Who ever understood more skilfully how to extract blameless mirth and innocent enjoyment from the simplest opportunities of domestic life? Who ever knew better how to soothe and tranquillize and support the spirit, when bowed under sorrow, or exhausted by sickness, or fading away in the dim eclipse of death? Compute the sum-total of these silent influences, spread through a whole life and operating at every instant, in their effect on the aggregate of human virtue and happiness; and it may be a question, whether, after all, they are not intrinsically worth more than the grander results which meet the eye of the world in a life of more conspicuous activity and wider fame. If from a retrospect of this life we turn our eyes to the vaster prospect which opens on the other side of the grave—of how little value and significance seem to us then all worldly successes, all reputation that we may have gained among men, any name for learning, wisdom or eloquence that we may leave behind us in this transitory scene of things, compared with that purity of mind which sought truth and beauty for themselves alone, and found in their simple possession its all-sufficient reward, that goodness of heart which forgot itself in sympathy with *others' happiness*, that childlike simplicity and

genuineness of nature which is the best preparation conceivable by us for the heavenly world and the presence of God!"

Dr. Hutton published little, and nothing, we believe, beyond the line of his professional vocation. Only once he engaged in theological controversy,—with a fellow-townsman, the late Dr. Hamilton, of Leeds, on the Calvinistic question. We subjoin a list of his publications, so far as we have been able to ascertain them, in a note below.* His philosophical and theological creed was in the main that which was prevalent among his denomina-

* 1. "The Shortness and Uncertainty of Human Life:" on the Death of Mr. Josias Stansfeld, Jan. 24, 1819.

2. "Piety and Virtue the only Terms of Final Acceptance with God:" preached before the Tract Society of the West-Riding of Yorkshire, May 12, 1819.

3. "Omniscience the Attribute of the Father only:" preached before the Association of Unitarian Christians residing at Hull and adjacent Places, Sept. 30, 1819.

4. The Sermon preached at the Ordination of the Rev. J. J. Taylor, B.A., Mosley Street, Manchester, 1821.

5. Sermon on the Death of the Rev. Henry Turner, of Nottingham, Feb. 10, 1822.

6. "The False Accusers of the Brethren reproved, and the Accused instructed how to Reply:" preached before the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, May 28, 1828.

7. "Unitarians entitled to the Name of Christians:" preached in Mill-Hill Chapel, Leeds, Oct. 30, 1831. To which is added, a Letter to the Rev. R. W. Hamilton.

8. "Unitarian Christianity vindicated," in Four Letters to the Rev. R. W. Hamilton, 1832.

9. Farewell Letter to the Mill-Hill Congregation, Leeds, Dec. 6, 1834.

10. "Man's Right and Privilege to judge for Himself, and to be judged by God only:" preached to the Little Carter-Lane Congregation, on the Celebration of the Third Centenary of the Reformation, Oct. 4, 1835.

11. "Repentance the Ground of Forgiveness:" printed for the American Unitarian Association, Sept., 1838.

12. "Miracles essential to the Proof of a Divine Commission:" Two Discourses preached in Greengate Chapel, Salford, and Cross-Street Chapel, Manchester, Dec. 30, 1838.

13. "Religious Equality:" preached in Little Carter-Lane Chapel, London, Feb. 24, 1839.

14. Sermon on the Death of the Rev. Lant Carpenter, LL.D., April 26, 1840.

15. "Jesus Christ our Teacher and Lord by Divine not by Self Appointment:" preached at Little Carter-Lane Chapel, Jan. 24, 1841.

16. Funeral Address on the Death of Mrs. Nicholls, March, 1841.

17. "The Unity, Spirituality and Paternal Character of God:" preached at the Anniversary of the Eastern Unitarian Christian Society, June 30, 1842.

18. "Free Trade in the Treasures both of the Body and of the Mind, the Interest and Duty of Christians:" preached in June, 1842.

19. Sermon on the Rev. W. E. Channing, D.D., Nov. 6, 1842.

20. "The True Worshipers:" preached on the Opening of the New Chapel, Mill Hill, Leeds, Dec. 27, 1848.

21. Charge delivered to the Rev. J. H. Hutton, B.A., at his Inauguration as Minister at Gloucester, Nov. 22, 1849.

22. Three Sermons on the Union of Religion with Friendship, in the volume edited by Dr. Beard, for the Use of Families.

23. "The Twofold Duty of Obeying and Educating Conscience:" in the first volume of the Unitarian Pulpit.

24. An Address to the Sunday-School Teachers at the Mission Chapel, Milton Street, London.

25. Various Prayers in a volume of "Family Devotions" by his father, the *Rev. Joseph* Hutton, of Eustace-Street Chapel, Dublin, of which a fourth edition, *carefully revised* and edited by himself, was published in February, 1850.

tion of Christians in the early part of the present century. His mind was remarkably tenacious of opinions which it had once earnestly adopted. He came to his conclusions somewhat slowly; but having once fixed themselves in his mind, they were not easily dislodged. As might be expected from his remarkably sensitive temperament, he was deeply imbued with poetical feeling. In the summer of 1834, he visited Switzerland in the company of some very dear friends, and a hymn which he wrote on the Faulhorn, shews how gracefully his characteristic sensibility could express itself in verse. We recall the following stanzas, which we are sure our readers will not blame us for quoting:

"Blue misty lakes like mirrors clear,
Dimmed only by a breath divine,
And human homes to friendship dear
Whose far-seen windows brightly shine,

Touched by the sun's departing rays
That steep in gold the western sky—
These too are themes for joy and praise,
To warm the heart and melt the eye.

That setting sun! that rising moon!
That blue ethereal arch above!
No,—till our latest day has flown,
We'll ne'er forget this feast of love!

With trembling voice we hymn Thy name;
With awe we strike the vocal string:
Oh! touch our lips with heavenly flame;
Oh! teach our inmost hearts to sing."

Two little anecdotes will throw more light on the genuine nature of the man, than pages of general description. "About a week before his death," writes a member of his family, "as I was one day returning from a walk, I was surprised near home at being addressed suddenly by a pleasant-looking woman unknown to me. She said, 'If you please, ma'am, how's your father?' To which I replied, that he was pretty well, but that I did not know to whom I was speaking. She said, 'No, I dare say not; but we live at that corner house, and your father never passes without noticing my children kindly. They call him 'the kind gentleman;' and as I have not seen him the last two or three days, I was afraid something might be amiss with him.' I met the same person again the day before he was taken ill, when she again stopped me to inquire after him.

"Another anecdote to the same effect was related to us by a friend who came to call on us a few days ago. As she was coming, one of the clergymen of the town stopped her and said, 'You have lost a good friend;' and on her going on to speak of my father, he added, 'All the little boys in this neighbourhood

will miss him, for he never passed them without patting them on the head or giving them a kind word or a smile.'"

In Dr. Hutton our church has lost an exemplary minister, and all who knew him a beloved friend and a delightful and accomplished companion. We can ill spare such a man. This age of ours is full of bustle and pretension; there is a striving everywhere after notoriety and distinction, and none seem satisfied to remain where Providence has placed them. From the dust and heat and glare of the crowded highways of the world, it is delightful to turn to the refreshing image of a life beautiful from its very quietness and simplicity, wise and strong in all the essentials of human existence through trust in God and fidelity to conviction, and ever happy, with no extraordinary measure of outward prosperity, in the unanxious enjoyment of blessings daily renewed and the habitual forgetfulness of self.

J. J. T.

The documents which follow are a fitting appendix to this pleasing tribute to the memory of a most excellent man.—Ed. C. R.

Friar-Gate Chapel, April 15, 1860.

Dear Madam,—We, the Congregation assembling at the Friar-Gate Chapel, beg most respectfully to offer to you and to your family our heartfelt sympathy under your sudden melancholy bereavement. That our Heavenly Father may strengthen you to bear your affliction, giving you an increase of Christian Faith and Hope, is our earnest prayer.

We deeply feel the loss we have ourselves sustained in the death of the beloved and revered Pastor who for the last eight years has so faithfully laboured amongst us. We dare not attempt to delineate his character, nor to speak of the talents and varied attainments by which he won the high position he held in the Unitarian body; but we desire to express our grateful sense of the high privilege we have enjoyed in having been for so long a period under his kindly and enlightened pastoral care and guidance. None could listen to his weekly ministrations without having their views of Christian duty elevated and their hearts enlarged, nor become acquainted with his daily life without feeling the warmth and beauty of the Christian spirit by which it was animated. That we have too little profited by his instructions and example, many of us have to lament; but his memory will dwell in our hearts, and we trust that the good seed he has sown may yet spring up and bear fruit among us. Wishing you every blessing that can soothe and comfort your declining years,

We remain, dear Madam, yours most respectfully,
(Signed on behalf of the Congregation,)
Samuel Willder, Chairman.
W. Malin, Chapel-warden.

Leeds, April 8, 1860.

Dear Madam,—It is with feelings of deep regret that we have recently received the sad intelligence of the death of our much-esteemed friend and former Pastor, Dr. Hutton.

We are anxious to convey to you our sincere and affectionate sympathy on this mournful occasion. At the same time, we are fully sensible that any expression of sympathy on our part can contribute but little to mitigate the sorrow which must at this moment overwhelm you, and we feel assured that you are deriving consolation from a far higher source than any mere expression of condolence from us can possibly afford. Nevertheless, we cannot refrain from bearing our humble testimony to his many virtues, and recording our high opinion of his mental and moral excellences.

For seventeen years he occupied the pulpit of our chapel, proving himself a worthy successor of Dr. Priestley and Mr. Wood, men who in their lives and by their preaching contributed largely to bless and adorn the age in which they lived. It had been their task to defend the cause of Unitarian Christianity against a fierce and uncompromising hostility, and it was left to our dear departed friend to carry forward their work, and by the beauty of his own life to shew that the doctrines we profess are truly consistent with the most exalted piety.

Dr. Hutton ably vindicated our title to the Christian name in the spirit of a true disciple of Christ. He was the uncompromising friend of the liberty of conscience, and to the latest hour of his life proved the warm but generous opponent of all doctrinal tests and established articles of faith.

It is to the excellence of his ministrations; to his clear exposition of the Scriptures; to his unflinching advocacy and firm maintenance of the truth as it is in Jesus; to his devout and affectionate spirit, which fervently sought assistance from his Heavenly Father; to his complete resignation to the Divine Will under every circumstance of adversity and trial; to his kind and affectionate heart, ever ready and willing to acknowledge a brother in a fellow-man of whatever clime or creed; to his warm and generous advocacy of civil and religious liberty, that many amongst us are indebted for that portion of heavenly truth which we hold, and for that love of liberty which we profess.

We have indeed lost a highly-valued friend, whose affectionate interest at all times and in every season added joy to our gladness or dissipated the cloud of our sorrow. Nor is the loss ours alone. The whole Unitarian body has lost a friend whose loving spirit attracted its discordant elements, and united them around itself.

We all deeply lament such an irreparable loss, and pray Almighty God that He may be graciously pleased to vouchsafe His aid to enable you and your bereaved family to bear with fortitude and resignation the heavy affliction with which He has seen fit to visit you. It is the prayer of your attached friends.

Signed on behalf of the Mill-Hill Congregation,

To Mrs. Hutton. JOSEPH HENRY OATES, Chairman.

Copy of resolutions passed unanimously at a meeting of the Mill-Hill Congregation, held in the chapel on Sunday, April 8, 1860, at the close of the morning service,—

That a letter be addressed to Mrs. Hutton expressive of our deep and affectionate sympathy with her and her family, on the heavy loss which they have recently sustained by the death of Dr. Hutton.

That a Tablet be placed in this chapel as a tribute of our regard and esteem for the memory of the late Dr. Hutton.

At a meeting of the Committee of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, held April 17, 1860,—Charles Paget, Esq., M.P., President, in the chair,—it was proposed by James Heywood, Esq., seconded by Rev. R. B. Aspland, and carried unanimously,

That the decease of the Rev. Joseph Hutton, LL.D., of Derby, is an event to call forth from the members of this Committee an expression of their deep sorrow and their profound respect for his memory. That by his consistent course as a Unitarian Minister for more than forty years,—by his able defence, from time to time, of pure Christianity,—by his services for several years as an active member of this Association,—by the unfailing urbanity and courtesy of his manners,—and, above all, by the purity and holiness of life by which he habitually adorned the doctrine of his Saviour,—he had endeared himself to a very wide circle of religious associates and personal friends.

That this resolution be engrossed and signed by the officers of the Association, and forwarded to the Widow and Family of the late Dr. Hutton, with the assurance of the deep personal sympathy in their bereavement of every individual member of the Committee.

TRUTH OF CHRISTIANITY.

It arose in an enlightened and sceptical age, but amongst a despised and narrow-minded people. It earned hatred and persecution at home by its liberal genius and opposition to the national prejudices; it earned contempt abroad by its connection with the country where it was born, but which sought to strangle it in its birth. Emerging from Judea, it made its way outward through the most polished regions of the world—Asia Minor, Egypt, Greece, Rome; and in all it attracted notice and provoked hostility. Successive massacres and attempts at extermination, persecuted for ages by the whole force of the Roman empire, it bore without resistance, and seemed to draw fresh vigour from the axe; but assaults in the way of argument, from whatever quarter, it was never ashamed or unable to repel, and whether attacked or not, it was resolutely aggressive. In four centuries it had pervaded the civilized world; it had mounted the throne of the Cæsars; it had spread beyond the limits of their sway, and had made inroads upon barbarian nations whom their eagles had never visited; it had gathered all genius and all learning into itself, and made the literature of the world its own; it survived the inundation of the barbarian tribes, and conquered the world once more by converting its conquerors to the faith; it survived an age of barbarism; it survived the restoration of letters; it survived an age of free inquiry and scepticism, and has long stood its ground in the field of argument, and commanded the intelligent assent of the greatest minds that ever were; it has been the parent of civilization and the nurse of learning; and if light and humanity and freedom be the boast of modern Europe, it is to Christianity that she owes them.—*Bishop Fitzgerald in Cautions for the Times*, No. 29.

INTELLIGENCE.

MANCHESTER DISTRICT SUNDAY-SCHOOL ASSOCIATION.

In the number of the attendants and the spirit and interest of the proceedings, few meetings even in the north of England equal the periodical gatherings of our Sunday-school teachers. These annual assemblies of some of the most earnest Christian workers are a kind of œcumenical council, the proceedings of which every man interested in the Church, either of the present or the future, will do well to consider with attention. The proceedings of the Manchester District Sunday-School Association, at its fifteenth anniversary, held on Good Friday, at Dukinfield, were more than usually interesting and important. The day was remarkably fine, and the reputation of the Dukinfield teachers and congregation for hospitality and the other necessary arrangements assisted to draw together the largest assembly of friends from a distance ever seen at their anniversaries. There were collected friends from a variety of places in the counties of Lancaster, Chester and York. From Manchester, Mossley, Mottram, Hyde, Oldham, Dob Lane, Bury, Swinton, Sale, Stand, Todmorden, Birkenhead, Nantwich, &c., teachers were present. The Parent Society in London was represented by a deputation consisting of Rev. Henry Ierson, M.A., and Mr. I. M. Wade. The ministers of the district present were, Rev. John Gordon, Rev. John Cropper, Rev. John Colston, Rev. John Wright, Rev. W. Whitelegge, Rev. James Drummond, Rev. G. Fox, Rev. J. C. Street, Rev. Jas. Harrop, Rev. L. Taplin, Rev. M. Gibson, Rev. E. W. Hopkinson. Mr. M'Master and other students of the Home Missionary Board were also present. Soon after 11 o'clock the large and handsome chapel at Dukinfield was completely filled. The psalmody was of that hearty and effective kind in which the people of Lancashire delight. The religious service was conducted by Rev. R. Brook Aspland, who, taking as a text Hebrews viii. 11, gave a sketch of the progress of popular religious instruction, shewing how the instruction of the people was a necessary consequence of the Hebrew and Christian religions, and tracing some of the beneficent consequences which had resulted from the connection of religion with a Book. In dwelling on portions of the later history of popular instruction, the preacher pointed out the distinct marks of an overruling Providence, and shewed the influence on it of the Reformation, of Puritanism and Protestant Nonconformity, and he then proceeded to observe—"In nothing was the finger of Providence more apparent than in the history of the Sunday-school. When we look at the objects it aims to effect and the simplicity of the means used, and when in addition we remember the zeal for religious instruction which burnt so brightly in the Puritan and Nonconformist churches of England, we may almost wonder that the Sunday-school had not an earlier origin; but in nothing is the providence of God more apparent than in the dispensation of the *fulness of the time*. The latter portion of the eighteenth century, when the Sunday-school system arose, was the right time for a movement designed to spread, not only over the whole of this country, but over other countries and distant continents and islands. America then commenced a mighty career with the assertion of its independence. The swelling population of England and Ireland was preparing to burst through its insular restrictions and diffuse itself over colonies, some of which may eventually rival the mother country in the greatness of their power. Philosophical discoveries and mechanical inventions were on the eve of being introduced, which would bring distant parts of the same country and even widely-separated countries into close and continual intercourse. Many things concurred to shew that our country was about to take a new start of moral and political greatness and influence. Then it was that Providence put it into the heart of one or more benevolent Christians to devise a new agency for alleviating the ignorance and moral degradation of the poor children, previously neglected at home or running wild and exposed to the worst influences and temptations in the streets of our cities. Whether a Raikes or a Lindsey were the first to collect around him a Sunday-school is a comparatively unimportant question. The seed was planted; and small and insignificant as it seemed, it had shot up with unexampled vigour, it was still growing, it had already sent forth great branches, so that the fowls of the air might lodge under the shadow of it. The more I contemplate the working of the Sunday-school system and mark its adaptation to our peculiar national character and wants, the more am I struck with the *Providential* marks impressed on the institution. I do not unduly magnify its advantages, nor do I conceal

from myself its numerous defects. Taking it as it actually is, forgetting none of its shortcomings and weaknesses, I recognise in it an instrument of great and increasing good, and a remedy for some of the appalling evils of society. Sunday-schools, City and Domestic Missions and other associated benevolent agencies, have done much to save our common Christianity, and to give to the common people faith in it as a spiritual and a divine power. The profession of religion was becoming too much a matter of form, or so exclusively an affair of conflicting creeds, or so largely a matter of class, that there seemed some danger of our social system falling in twain, the lower portion indifferent to religion in any of its forms. At this critical moment some earnest and benevolent Christians began the work of the religious education of the poor. They thus bound together by new ties the poor and the rich; they taught the former to see and believe that Christianity was something more than an idle form or an angry creed, that it was a reality, something worth believing and loving, something that tended to make man dear to man, and to make the mass of society wiser and better and happier. I am not disposed to overrate the amount of good intellectually effected by Sunday-schools. I will concede to any moderate objector that in this direction we see in the Sunday-school the mere essays of infancy. It speaks still but feebly, indistinctly and uncouthly. But it will grow and gain strength. Now we see through a glass darkly, but presently we shall put away much of the weakness of the child and assume the strength of the Christian man. As the general education and intelligence of our countrymen improves, so will the Sunday-school advance in vigour and usefulness. Secular and religious instruction are not foes or rivals, but allies and friends. The higher men ascend in general intelligence, the nearer will they be to heaven, and the better will they be prepared to appreciate religious knowledge. If I put but a moderate estimate upon the intellectual good which Sunday-schools have hitherto effected, I find it not easy to realize and difficult to express the moral good which they have done. Here the benefit is confined within no narrow circle. It is not a blessing to the scholars only, but it probably does more to exalt the teachers than the taught. It gives a virtuous, a benevolent, an intellectual, a moral and a religious aim to hundreds and thousands of our fellow-countrymen, who otherwise might have passed through life knowing little of, caring nothing for religion, and *utterly unconscious* of the luxury of doing good. It has banded together in every town and village a number of active spirits, uniting them in virtuous and religious effort for the benefit of the poor and neglected. The *indirect* advantages and blessings of Sunday-schools probably much surpass in importance their immediate effects." The preacher then drew a picture of the position and prospects of the country, and its influences on the civilization and Christianity of the world, and shewed how great the work was that had to be done, and how mighty its results if faithfully performed. He concluded by an earnest appeal to the teachers whom he addressed to be true to their calling as practical disciples of the Great Teacher.

Immediately on the close of the religious service, the strangers from a distance adjourned to the school-buildings, where they found a substantial meal laid out in the large room. Between 300 and 400 partook of the dinner, their comfort being sedulously cared for by the teachers and friends of the Dukinfield congregation. Soon after 2 o'clock, the friends re-assembled in the chapel. Owing to the absence of Mr. Samuel Robinson, the announced Chairman, detained by public duties at the Assizes, Rev. J. Gordon was called upon to preside. The report of the Committee was read by Mr. Jeffrey Worthington, the Secretary. It referred to the appointment of Mr. J. Taylor, of Hyde, as Visitor, in the place of the Rev. Jos. Freeston, who had resigned. Mr. Taylor entered upon his duties in January last, and had since visited the schools at Mossley, Dukinfield, Dob Lane, Padiham, Flowery Field, Monton, Manchester (New Bridge Street and Rochdale Road), Swinton, Stand, Todmorden and Heywood. Visits had also been paid by members of the Committee to the schools at Stockport, Newchurch, Oldham, Flowery Field, Rochdale, Bollington, Accrington (a new school, to which a grant of books had been made) and Styal. The students of the Home Missionary Board had kindly held meetings of teachers on behalf of the Association in some of the districts where they had been engaged in preaching. The publication of the Sunday-School Penny Magazine had been attended with considerable loss during the past year, but some changes had been made in connection with it, and there was every reason to hope it would prove self-supporting. Three schools had become connected with the Association during the past year, viz., Birkenhead, Accrington, and Hulme Domestic Mission.

The statistical report shewed that there were now 49 schools in the Association. Of these, 6, viz., Ainsworth, Altrincham, Burnley, Chorley, Liverpool (Renshaw

Street) and Macclesfield (King Edward Street), had not made any return. The number of scholars on the books was 7801 (4108 male and 3693 female); and the average attendance, as far as could be ascertained, was 5257 in the morning, and 5700 in the afternoon. The total number of teachers on the books was 1195 (648 male and 547 female); and the average attendance was stated to be 669 in the morning, and 705 in the afternoon. This great discrepancy between the number on the register and the average attendance is no doubt chiefly owing to the fact of many teachers only taking classes half the day or every alternate Sundays. This is evidenced by the fact of there being only 684 classes in the schools. As already stated, these returns are from 43 of the 49 schools in the Association. Comparing them with the returns of 46 schools in the union last year, there is a decrease of 367 in the number of scholars on the books, and 230 in average attendance; there are 35 fewer teachers on the books, but an increase of 72 in average attendance. Of the 43 schools which had made returns, 7 only are without auxiliary institutions. The following is an analysis of these in the case of the remaining 36:—21 have libraries (varying from 100 to 1600 vols.); 20, week-evening classes; 7, mutual improvement societies; 1, reading-room; 9, singing-classes; 13, savings banks or providential societies; 11, sick and burial clubs; 4, clothing funds; 1 (Lower Mosley Street, Manchester), brotherly fund, raised by monthly contributions of 1*d.* from each scholar, for the relief of those scholars who are kept from school through sickness or from want of suitable clothes; 1 (Newchurch), missionary fund; 4, temperance societies or bands of hope. Lectures are delivered on week-evenings in many of the schools, but the returns are not complete on this head. At Lancaster, the minister delivers lectures or gives exhibitions of a popular character on scientific subjects every month; at Mossley, the minister conducts separate week-evening classes for young men and women; at Park Lane, near Wigan, and Rochdale Road, Manchester, there is a minister's class; at Preston, the minister has a class for training young men and women for teachers; and at 6 schools there are Bible-classes, which are taught, in nearly every instance, by the minister. The teachers of the Swinton school meet every Sunday night for religious improvement. At 31 of the 43 schools there are teachers' meetings held, for the most part, once a month. At Birkenhead, there is a monthly service in the church for children; at Bury, there is a short service for scholars in the afternoon; at Newchurch, there are quarterly scholars' services; at Dean Row and Styal, there are scholars' services every Sunday; at Lower Mosley Street (Manchester) and Warrington, there is a service for scholars every Sunday morning. The largest school in the Association is that at Mossley, it having an average attendance of 743 scholars and 100 teachers. The schools at Chowbent and Dob Lane (near Manchester) are stated to be in so flourishing a condition that additional room is required. The efforts of the teachers at Congleton are sadly crippled for want of a more suitable building. At Gee Cross, the school-building is about to be pulled down in order to make room for one larger and more commodious. Stand school is crowded and prosperous, and a more commodious building is about to be erected.

Mr. C. J. Herford, the Treasurer, read the statement of the accounts, which shewed an excess of £19. 6*s.* 8*d.* of income over expenditure; but he explained that the apparent balance only arose from the fact of the Visitor's services having been secured for only a part of the year.

The proceedings of the business meeting which followed were spirited and harmonious. A series of excellent addresses were given by Rev. John Wright, Mr. John Booth, Mr. C. J. Herford, Mr. Robinson, Rev. J. Cropper, Rev. J. Freeston, Mr. David Harrison, Rev. James Harrop, Rev. R. B. Aspland, Dr. Marcus, Rev. John Colston, Mr. Wade, Mr. S. Broadrick and Mr. Glossop. The topics discussed were the income of the Society, the circulation of the Penny Sunday-School Magazine, now edited by Rev. A. W. Worthington, the Hymn-book in the course of preparation by the Parent Society, and the mode in which the materials were supplied by the superintendents of the several schools to the Secretary for drawing up the school statistics. We think it better to reserve what space we have to spare to a full report of the principal addresses given at the evening meeting. But we may mention here that an effort was made at the meeting to extend the subscription list of the Association, that with this view papers were handed round for signature, and that in the course of the evening new subscriptions were announced amounting to nearly £10. The resolutions adopted were of the usual kind, including acknowledgment of the services of the officers, the preacher and the chairman, and of the late editor of the Magazine, the Rev. John Wright.

A little before five o'clock, the friends again assembled, to the number of nearly 500, in the school-buildings, where tea was

comfortably provided in both the large room and another. The ladies of the congregation (who had had a large share in providing the tables) presided. The scene was a very animated one, and afforded great pleasure to the assembled guests. At the conclusion of tea, the friends returned to the chapel, and the chair was taken by Mr. Samuel Greg. After a hymn had been sung, the CHAIRMAN observed that he took his place among them with considerable pleasure. He had a strong feeling that they who were labouring as Sunday-school teachers had a moral right to claim the countenance and sympathy of others not so toiling. He rejoiced to see so large an assembly of friends, many of them having come to them from considerable distances. He trusted the meeting would not be fruitless, that the hearts of the teachers would be cheered, that their hands would be strengthened, and that they would feel that their brotherhood is larger than their personal acquaintance, and that they had the silent co-operation of many whom they seldom saw and whose voices they never heard. He was glad that their deliberations were to take from the outset a distinct shape, and that they were to have the benefit of Mr. Wright's experienced counsel on a subject of great practical importance.

Rev. JOHN WRIGHT, in addressing the Association on the subject of "Religious Instruction in the Sunday-school," spoke in nearly these words:—I feel it is a pleasure and a privilege to stand up to speak to so many of you this evening. I can speak with confidence to Sunday-school teachers, because I know that they are desirous of increasing their means of usefulness, and that he who speaks to them on such a subject is sure of receiving their earnest attention. Moreover, I speak with pleasure to you, because I know that you are engaged in the same kind of employment, on one day of the week at least, as myself, and that we can therefore sympathize together. We are interested in the same cause—we are engaged in the same work; we must therefore feel mutual sympathy. I have to speak on the subject of the religious instruction of our Sunday-schools. I shall not aim to offer you a full consideration and treatment of this question. My remarks will be rather suggestive than exhaustive. It will be my business to open the subject, yours to discuss it. I propose to give you the text, and leave you to speak the sermon. We are all agreed that religious education is *the business* of the Sunday-school. We need *not stop to*-night to consider to what extent *anything else* may be introduced in addition. There may be special circumstances in each school which may lead the managers to introduce this kind or that of secular instruction. But we are all agreed that religious instruction is the main business of each Sunday-school. This agreement is only the first step, but it is a most important step. To know what you want to do is the pre-requisite to ascertaining the best means of effecting it. If we are united in this opinion, that we must make *religious* instruction the first and chief business of our Sunday-schools, we are prepared to go on to the next question, How is this best given?

There is no task that can be assigned to a man so difficult, or which calls for so much care and diligence, as the task of attempting to teach religion. It is easy enough to teach a science, such as astronomy, in which you have to explain certain facts and laws and principles. It is easy enough to teach an art, when you have to explain in what manner certain things are to be done, as in painting. Religion is a science and an art and something more. The science of it you may teach without difficulty; that is, you may instruct in theology. The art of it, that is, morality, you may explain clearly enough; but theology and morality are not the whole of religion. It has, I believe, a threefold existence. Its root is in the intellect, which must help us to decide what we are to believe; its substance is in the heart, in what we feel; its fruit is to be seen in the life, prompting what we do. We have therefore to attend to each of these three elements in teaching religion—the intellectual, the emotional and the practical.

The first of these includes within itself two branches, that which concerns knowledge of ascertained and unquestioned facts, and that which concerns beliefs such as may be matter of argument. Many teachers achieve a tolerable amount of success in the former by the help of text-books, infusing into the minds of their pupils some knowledge of scripture history, antiquities, geography and so forth. This knowledge is not by any means to be neglected; it is the first and easiest step in our religious instructions. We next have to help our scholars to form a system of theological belief. In the matter of intellectual convictions respecting religion, there is a considerable reluctance in some teachers to convey truth to the minds of their pupils. It appears to me that this is altogether an unnecessary reluctance. It is necessary that the adult teacher should instruct his class in those things which he himself believes to be true, which he thinks it likely that they will receive and make their own.

and that in speaking to children he should speak with authority. It is not possible to teach religion to your scholars unless you have a clear system of theology in your own mind. A teacher whose mind is beclouded or is in a perpetual state of uncertainty, or one who has put off the consideration of certain important questions because he does not like the trouble of coming to a decision,—I see not how it is possible for such a teacher to convey definite impressions to his pupils. It is necessary for us to attain definite intellectual ideas of religion, both to teach historic facts and to explain Christian doctrine. At the same time I would not encourage the habit, especially with the young, of arguing on every religious question. They should not be accustomed to look on religion as a mere question of logic, as a topic of debate to be judged of solely by the intellect. In the earlier periods of training, I would rather address their religious feelings and instincts than their reason. While I would not shrink from teaching them to prepare themselves for the exercise of the right of private judgment, I would at the same time point out to them that he who does the will of God is further advanced than he who simply knows it or can argue about it.

With regard to the second part of theological instruction, morality, *that* is comparatively easy to teach—so easy that I need not stop to-night to speak about it. But I pass on at once to the third department of religion to be taught? When you have implanted in the mind of your scholars the religion addressed to the intellect, when you have made them understand the truths of morality and the duties of the various relations of life, how can you best take the remaining step? How can you be sure that they will *feel* religiously, that they will have the influences of religion in their hearts? We shall all acknowledge that one thing is essential in order thus to teach religion—namely, we must ourselves feel it. It is not possible that the sacred fire which we desire to kindle in the souls of our pupils can burn, unless there be a spark of it in our own souls from which we may enkindle it. He who has no personal religious convictions, who has no experience of religion in the individual soul, and is nevertheless a Sunday-school teacher, has mistaken his function, and should hasten to lay down an office for which he has no qualifications. I fear we sometimes commit a grave error in accepting the proffered services of men as Sunday-school teachers, without at the same time inquiring how far they are religious persons. It not *un*frequently happens that if a person is intellectually acute, if he has considerable intelligence, we joyfully accept his help in the school. We say there are other things beside religion to be taught, and we can make use of such persons without asking them to teach religion. I think in such conduct we make a great mistake. We ought to have no person brought in contact with our scholars who is not decidedly a religious person, by conviction a Christian. I do not mean that he must begin his work by making profession of some particular form of doctrine, but that the Sunday-school teacher must be one who feels in his own heart the power of religion. Teachers without religious convictions, who feel none of the power of religion, however clever they may be, are unfit for their work. Until you have religious teachers, and none but religious teachers, in your schools, you will never get them into the state in which they ought to be. I fear that in many of our schools there is a tendency to seek intellectual rather than spiritual improvement. Do we not sometimes find that persons habitually religious in their habits and feelings, because they have not the amount of secular knowledge supposed to be necessary, are put aside to make room for others who exceed them in quickness and secular knowledge, but are far behind them in religious acquirements? Every man who has personal experience of religion has some qualifications for becoming a teacher in a Sunday-school. In the next place, supposing we have a set of teachers such as we desire, it is necessary that they should cultivate religion. None of our feelings will be healthy and strong if we do not systematically provide the means of their discipline and growth and power. The man who cut himself off from all access to books could not expect that his knowledge would increase or his intellect gain strength. So our religious feelings will not be strong unless we cultivate and develop and discipline them. There must be stated religious exercises. Let teachers arrange a plan for the personal cultivation of religion, whether by occasional prayer-meetings or in some other way. Perhaps it may be said that prayer-meetings are not thought by some to be the best means of securing religious tastes and habits. But if our teachers are in earnest in the matter of religion, they will either adopt this plan, or, if they do not like this, will find some other mode of reaching the desired end. Let it not be supposed that a man can safely neglect outward ordinances. I cannot understand how teachers who are not regularly in their *places* in the house of God or at the table

of their Lord, who are content to go on, week after week, year after year, without taking any special means for keeping alive the spirit of devotion, which they profess to wish to communicate to others, can imagine they are fulfilling their duty.—I do not think we can lay down any precise plans for teaching the emotional part, the substance of religion, that love to God and that love to man which is its essence. But we may perhaps devise plans by which those who seek for the influences of vital religion may succeed in finding them. They should set apart a certain portion of time for reading religious and devotional books; they should make it their business to transfuse into their own hearts the sentiments of devotion they read and teach. The teacher who thus strives to increase his own religious feelings will be able to shew forth in everything he says and does the religion that lives in his own soul, and the mysterious influence of character, that which one mind exercises over another mind,—an influence which you may not be able to account for, but which you feel,—this will act from the teacher on the scholar. So strongly do I feel on this point, that there is, I must confess, one subject which appears in the questions we have in the statistical report which jars on my feelings. I refer to the question, "How many teachers have during the year joined the church?" I should like the answer to be, "None—for all were previously members of the church." I trust the time will come when our Sunday-schools will be Christian institutions in deed as well as in name,—when it will be not only recognized that it is the duty of Sunday-schools to teach religion, but we shall be able to add the fact, the delightful fact, that this is what they do succeed in teaching. Mr. Wright sat down amid general applause.

The Chairman then called on Rev. Henry Ierson to address the meeting. He spoke as follows:—The spirit in which you, Sunday-school teachers, must labour, is the spirit in which we ministers must labour, if each would look for success. The closer the tie is bound between ministers and teachers, the more the blessing of God is likely to rest on the united labours of both. Whatever involves the interests of Sunday-schools engages the profoundest sympathies of my heart. I am glad therefore to take part in any work which helps forward the business of Sunday-school instruction. In this view I have assisted in the publication of that new Hymn-book on which you have heard some remarks made. I look upon the advice given you *by a friend* to-day as extremely good, that *the scholars*, and especially the elder scholars, should be instructed in religion in part by means of the Hymn-book. For this purpose it should be cheap and yet comprehensive. When it was found that the entire number of the copies of the old Hymn-book was exhausted, the question arose whether we should reprint it from our stereotype plates, or whether we should take the opportunity of making the volume more complete by the required additions. The result of our deliberations was to issue an improved and revised Hymn-book. In this revised book all the best hymns familiar to those who use Martineau's Hymn-book will have a place. The collection will contain above 300 hymns, for which the extremely small charge of 4½d. will be made. I trust the volume will be better received than might be feared from the field being in some places in the possession of another book, though we have not the slightest wish to interfere with the use of the Norwich Hymn-book where that is already employed. We intend besides to reprint our own old edition for the sake of those who may prefer to avoid the expense of the change; but those that can conveniently make a change will certainly benefit by the publication of the new collection. I may remark in reference to these details, that many of the greatest interests with which our human life is connected may be identified with others apparently minute and even grossly material. I was greatly struck, when listening this morning to the interesting detail given us by the preacher of the history of popular education and its relation to Christianity, by the thought that the salvation of immortal souls should have been made dependent on the knowledge communicated to children of the letters of the English alphabet. And it is strictly true. You could not have listened to that discourse this morning without feeling a strong sympathy with the admirable description given of that religion which God has given through the medium of a book, identifying thus men's spiritual life with their advancement in letters and in general knowledge. It has indeed been made a matter of objection to the Christian religion that it should be conveyed to mankind in a book. All the possible and conceivable faults of that book have been laid hold of in order to discredit the religion which it contains. I believe that this is the captious and wretched spirit in which many of the rationalistic objections to religion have their source. It is, however, one of the most glorious things connected with the religion of Jesus Christ, that that religion,—the foundations of which were laid so many ages before and which was designed

to endure hundreds of thousands of years, —it is a most remarkable thing that a religion so grand in its issue should have been given to us in records like those of the Bible. Looking at the history of that book, its source must be traced higher than man. I could not help thinking how remarkable it was that in the whole compass of Jewish literature there should be nothing worth looking at except a certain number of histories, psalms, odes, gospels and letters, which, by their immeasurable superiority to everything else of Jewish origin, contain the justification of their existence, as also of that deep veneration with which they have ever been regarded. If any man ask, how the religion thus communicated to us in a book should be taught, we may say that the answer is contained in the question itself. You cannot better teach it to others than by using the same means by which you have learnt it. Whence did you get your knowledge but from the book? How can you teach it save by using the book? But you must use that book intelligently. You will not suppose that I would recommend you in interpreting such a collection of ancient writings to discard the best helps of thought and learning, and surround yourselves with a circle of conventional darkness and of traditional fable into which light cannot penetrate. There can be no doubt that much learning is necessary to enable you to interpret this book. It is given to you in a human form. Through the human agency employed, human limitations are necessarily blended with it. This is the reason of the difficulty of its interpretation. Whatever is manifestly divine in the book, the merest child can understand. But mingled with this there must needs be a good deal of human cement, old forms of speech, obsolete customs, temporary modes of feeling: this we must endeavour to separate from the rest. For I do not see how a person can teach religion out of the Scriptures who does not understand the Scriptures. It is sad that there should in any quarters exist an objection to the presenting to the popular mind important religious truth in the simple and real language of Holy Scripture. One of the greatest difficulties which we as Unitarians have to contend with in giving to the poor religious instruction by means of the Bible, arises out of the difficulty of making them understand it in the present Authorized Version. Many passages are translated in a biassed, orthodox and Calvinistic sense. But the common people take the existing words to be an essential part of the book, and they refuse to accept a better rendering of these because they forget the medium through which the present translation has come to them. I trust the time will come when we shall have a faithful translation in simple language to place in the hands of the people. There is in course of publication at the present time such a translation, which I trust all of you will take means to procure.—I mean the translation which is being brought out in volumes by the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, by the late Mr. Wellbeloved, Mr. Scott Porter and Mr. Vance Smith. If you use that translation, some people will cry out that it is a Unitarian Bible. Don't be alarmed, however, by that cry. Do what you will, you will be reproached for it. Heed not that. Determine simply to seek the true and right course, and then abide by it. Let no man deter you from that. I know well that the perils of liberty are great. One of the greatest of the perils that Unitarian liberty has had to contend with has arisen from the very greatness of the liberty itself. It seems to have affected the minds of some of our young persons with a feeling of uncertainty and doubt, whether after all it was a desirable state in which to live. They have not to contend with some of the temptations common to others, but they have in some instances become impatient, and were disposed to doubt if the Almighty presence was with them, because they were not environed by a multitude, and because they had few of the associations of this world's power and grandeur. But I trust a better and a more healthy sentiment is growing up in the minds of Unitarians, and that they will come to see that the sincerest religion consists in devotion to, and the practice of, God's will; that the effort to set that before the minds of the poor is quite sufficient to keep them strong, and to reconcile them to the condition of a persecuted life. They will still no doubt have to suffer some things; for every man who will in this age of shams live dutifully to Christ and up to the Christian standard must suffer persecution. There may be different ways of teaching from the Bible; but if you are to make it expository of religious truth to others, you must yourself have some sympathy with it. The doctrine of that book may be regarded in two aspects,—one relating to the outer world, the other relating to the world within. I have much sympathy with the old Puritan estimate of the Bible. I believe that the Old Testament had much value, and has that value still. It is a fact—it was pointedly alluded to in the sermon this morning—that the liberty of man does move along the same pathway in which the comparatively humble arts of reading and writing go. Wherever

the Bible goes and there is the habit of reading it, there the chains of slavery are about to be broken. Even that Bible in your hands, with all its mistranslations, unintelligible as it has been in parts made by the influence of bigotry, even that Bible exercises a mighty power in establishing the reign of liberty. Have you true sympathy with the spirit of that book with regard to liberty? Many of those who constitute the mass of the people, have got the idea that those of a higher class than their own have no sympathy with them in their aspirations after a better condition—have, in fact, no sympathy with the doctrine taught in the Bible of the equal rights of all men. I am not going to talk Radicalism, for I am not a Radical. I am not going to talk Chartism, under the name of religion. But I know that many persons take much trouble, in vain, though in the name of religion, to impress the poor with the persuasion of their sympathy with them. There is a manner of conveying to the minds of the poor the sentiment of respect if you have it. There is not the power, if you have it not. If there are many who do not with all their efforts succeed, they fail because they have not in fact the sympathy which they profess. The poor are quick enough in finding out where the sentiment is wanting. They can learn the fact from the very tread of the foot, or the rustle of the dress, of their visitor; and if these meet, when they go thus in the wrong spirit, with a boorish reception, it is not to be wondered at. I trust that the book of which we have been speaking will be more largely and more intelligently studied by the people. Then will it correct some of the alarming and frightful blunders into which they sometimes fall in the matter of social economy. Could they enter into the spirit of that book, they might be saved much mistake and misery. The present is a fit season for persuading them to admit into their hearts the simple doctrine of the gospel. They are in a better condition than formerly, and there is reason to hope that the philosophy which is gaining ground amongst them partakes more than of old of that divine equity which Christ teaches us. On the other point, the spiritual teaching of the Scriptures, what I would add is but the echo of what Mr. Wright has already so forcibly said. There is, we have seen, a close connection between the A B C and the highest aims of the soul: between the merest elements of learning and the highest anthems of the heavenly choir. However widely separated, they are all links of one chain reaching from *earth to heaven*. The teacher must always feel this. He whose heart does not feel the influence of the gospel will not succeed in conveying its electrical influence to the minds of the poor. Mr. Wright has also alluded to the necessity of teaching plainly and fearlessly the doctrines of the gospel. I have often said the same thing in London. I have said that Unitarianism should strengthen itself by a firmer backbone of thought, and by clear, positive utterance. Our Unitarian doctrine should be stamped into the very soul of our people. But then some of my friends shake their heads and say, "Ah! that is all very true; but is it not much better to convey religious truth through the personal influence of the character?" I do not understand why we should think of separating the religious sentiment and the influence of religious character from the definite and full statement of Christian doctrine. The clear light of doctrine ought to go with the pure feeling. I cannot comprehend why any man should advocate the one and slight the other. But if I am asked why I give prominence to the duty of acquiring clear intellectual convictions, I answer that our present defect lies here, and not in the element of feeling. I do not believe at all that Unitarians are defective in religious sentiment. I think they are, with the entire mass of their countrymen, feeling more and more religious. All men who are religious at all are growing stronger in the sentiment, and Unitarians are growing stronger with the rest. But as to matter of clear doctrine, I do think, as I have said, that we are somewhat in danger from our superabundant liberty. Another danger lies in the tendency, as we mingle constantly with the mass of those around us, to say, "We will throw aside these controversies. We are content to take the Christianity of the mass. Mere Unitarianism will die out. Its work is done; its ministers have only to buy a wallet and beg." If this is to be the result, let me frankly say that I should wish the crisis to come soon; I would rather meet it now than postpone the evil to some distant day. Let me, however, assure any of the young people around me who have got hold of this piece of sentimentalism, that in ten years' time they will mourn in dust and ashes if they flinch now from their fidelity and turn back to the flesh-pots of Egypt. I know what Calvinism is; I know what Trinitarianism is. If they give up the pure and simple faith of the gospel for the popular creed,—for a Calvinism which can only be in a very partial sense accounted a gospel of God's love,—for a dogma of Trinitarianism which professes to teach nothing but an obscure mystery of words,—

they will find that they have wasted their time and lost their way, and covered themselves with the dust of mediæval times, of which they ought to be utterly ashamed. And now, in conclusion, let me say that it is with a feeling of extreme delight that I have joined with you to-day in these services. I shall carry back with pleasure to London the report of all I have seen and heard. I shall tell my colleagues of our Association there, that if they want to know what a meeting of Sunday-school teachers should be, real spirit in a real body, they must themselves come down to receive a like cordial welcome with that which we have enjoyed in Dukinfield.

The CHAIRMAN then addressed the meeting in these words:—It is so long since I myself took any active part in the actual working of a Sunday-school, that I could throw little light on the details to which Mr. Wright has been directing our attention. In the remarks I will venture to offer you, I must address myself to the general aspect of the subject, and remind you of some of the peculiar characteristics of the work in which you are engaged, the manner in which this work must be met, and the results that you may reasonably expect to see flow from it.

There are several features about these Sunday-schools by which they are honourably distinguished, not *from* but *among* the various progressive institutions of our time and country. With very imperfect machinery, with very uncertain means, with only half-formed tools, they have yet accomplished very considerable results. Indeed, the good they have done has been incalculable; it has been what no reports or statistics can either measure or describe. The indirect good they have done has indeed been greater than the direct good. They have bound together in one common bond of reciprocal benefit and affection the thousands of individuals and the various underlying strata that compose the humbler classes of society among us. They have given to these one common object, and that object has been the highest that can be proposed to man,—the cultivation of the mind, the practice of virtue, and the knowledge of religion. Indeed, without the operation of these schools, it is difficult to say what, at the present time, would have been the moral, intellectual and religious condition of the great masses of our population in these northern latitudes. The National Church, as it calls itself, has been long since proved to be by no means large enough to be the Church of the nation. The nation has outgrown and spread beyond it; and it is now no more able to supply the religious wants of a whole people than the government would be to feed them. Another good point, too, about these Sunday-schools is that, as they exist for the benefit of the people, so they have been the work of the people. The people felt the want; the people have supplied the want. In doing this, they have afforded a striking example of how much may often be accomplished by the combined efforts of numbers, where perhaps the separate efforts of each single individual would not have been able to accomplish anything at all. It is impossible to look round us upon the present condition of the world, or backward on the pages of its bygone history, without meeting everywhere examples of the power of this great principle of combination. Nature itself is full of illustrations of it. The little rivulet that trickles down the mountain's side scarcely arrests the notice of the passing traveller, and its low and gentle murmurs, though they speak indeed of innocence and purity, speak in no voice of power. But when that rivulet is joined by ten thousand others like its tiny self, its waters swell into a mighty river. Then they can rend mountains, fertilize provinces, and divide kingdoms; and their voice is no longer heard in the low murmur of the rivulet, but in the rushing of the torrent, the roar of the rapid, and the loud thunder of the cataract.

And if, instead of looking at the waters of a river, you look rather to the history of a nation, you will find everywhere examples of the same principle. Look, for instance, at the history of our own land. What has made England that which we see her now? Can you point to the name of any one man in the records of the past who has been to us what Moses was to the Hebrews, or even what Washington was to the Americans? Can you point to the name of any one individual man over whose tomb we could erect a monument of brass or marble, and write upon it as his epitaph, "Here lies the father of his country"? Or look along the living line of the great and noble who yet stand among us, and see if there be any *one* to whom the finger of the blindest adulation could point and say, "There stands the man on whom depends the greatness of his country." Not one. Thank Heaven, not one! Neither can you say that we owe our liberties or our greatness to our laws or our constitution; for who made those laws, and who made that constitution? No, my friends; the greatness and prosperity of this our native land rests upon a much firmer and more broad foundation. It has not been systems, or laws, or constitutions, that have made England what she is,—but MEN. And it has not

been *one* man, but millions of men. It has not been the great and the noble—though these, too, have done their part, and done it greatly and nobly—but then it has necessarily been the lesser part. To speak broadly, England has been made great by the small. It has been the people, the whole people, high and low, rich and poor, gentle and simple, who, under Heaven, have been the architects of their own fortunes. And the reason why we should observe and acknowledge this truth as we peruse the pages of our country's history, is, that we may also understand, and remember, and lay it well to heart, that that which has made England what she is, to that also we must look for keeping her what she is. And that when we are considering what we have to trust to for our future progress, we must not depend on what laws, or parliaments, or governments, can do for us; we must not look to this great man or to that great man to be our saviour, our protector, or our prophet; but we must remember that England is made up of Englishmen, and that in the hour of peace, as in the hour of peril, she expects, not one man, but EVERY MAN, to do his duty.

Nor, in saying all this, am I wandering from the subject of our discussion. For the same principle applies to our Sunday-schools, and indeed to almost every other popular institution that has for its object the moral, social or religious amelioration of the people. In all these the people must do their own work, and they must do it by the combined efforts of multitudes; the single effort of the individual being small—the combined effort of the multitude being mighty. It has been said, in speaking of the revenue, that it is only by taxing the million that we can raise millions. And so it is only by the combined effort of the million that we can hope to effect any real and permanent amelioration in the condition of the million. And though among the numbers who thus labour for the public weal there be not *one* who shall leave behind him a name or a remembrance, yet does not each on that account the less contribute his share towards building up those great monuments of national utility on which only the object of the builders, and not the names of them, shall hereafter be inscribed. So that the work be done, what matter who has done it? Which of us can now tell who built the Pyramids of Egypt? There, indeed, they stand in their lonely grandeur, the strange, mysterious monuments of an earlier world, looming out of the dim obscurity of forgotten ages. There they stand, still firm and *mountain-like* upon their broad foundations, looking out on one side over the boundless desert, and on the other down upon the green valley of the Nile. Ages and generations have floated by them—and now we, the children of this remoter time, stand gazing in wonder on their giant forms, and questioning them as to the unknown records of their youth. We climb their summits, we dig to their foundations, we explore, and examine, and speculate, and ask them of their birth and history, and to whom we are to ascribe the glory of their erection. But there is no sound, nor voice, nor any that answereth. We are told, indeed, that 100,000 men were labouring for twenty years at the erection of only one of them. Where are those 100,000 now? What record of their individual selves have they left behind them? Not a vestige or remembrance—nothing but THEIR WORK—nothing but that huge Pyramid which their hands piled up into a mountain. The doers of the deed, the workers of the work, are passed away. The deed, the work, the monument, stands there for ever.

So let it be with you. You are labouring at a work greater than the building of a Pyramid, and may well be satisfied if the work remain, and the workers pass away and be forgotten. Yes! greater than the building of a Pyramid; for those who in any way, however humble, are labouring sincerely, and with a single eye to do good to their fellow-men, are labouring in the same great cause for which apostles have preached, for which heroes have fought, for which martyrs have died. They may claim fellowship with the spirits of the great and good, of all ages and nations, who have toiled and suffered before them in the same holy path. It is a work, too, in which the small is even as the great, for all distinction between the servants is lost in the high nature of their common service. Whatever be the work assigned to each one among us, whether it be great or whether it be small, he is the best servant who best does that service. And whether it be to lay a stone upon the wall of God's temple, or only to plant a flower at the gate of it,—whether it be to break a nation's chain, or to lift a fallen brother out of the mire of sin,—whether it be to enlighten and illustrate an age, or only to help a little child up the first steps to knowledge,—the man who, in his Master's name, does any one of these things, is equally labouring in that Master's service, and may feel, gratefully and humbly, that so far he is that Master's servant.

Go on, then, my friends, you who are thus labouring in this little corner of your Lord's vineyard—go on in His name, and

may His blessing speed you! Faint not, nor be weary in your good work. Having put your hand to the plough, do not look back and leave it in the furrow. Cast in your seed freely and abundantly, and be not too anxiously careful where it may fall, or how it may grow, or whether indeed it may ever spring up to life at all. God will see to that. You do your part, and fear not that His shall fail. The seed will not perish if it be His will that it should grow. The future leave to Him. The present only is ours. Let us work while it is called day. Let us plough, and harrow, and cast in our seed, and then fearlessly leave the harvest to ripen on our graves. That harvest may be reaped here. The song of the harvest home will be sung hereafter, and the words of it perhaps may be—"Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye did it unto me."

The Chairman having called upon some one of the teachers present to address the meeting, Mr. GLOSSOP obeyed the call, and said he believed that all of them would go from the meeting cheered and improved by what they had heard. He wished to suggest the good that might be attained if teachers would form classes amongst themselves for mutual instruction. There was something to be learnt besides the actual knowledge that was to form the material of instruction, and that was, the best mode of instilling knowledge into other minds. By meeting together and comparing plans and conversing on methods of teaching, they would probably do much to forward the work they had at heart. As to the important subject of religious instruction and the best mode of communicating it, one of the difficulties attending it was our very familiarity with the subject. We did not always realize to ourselves the intellectual and moral and spiritual wants of those whom we wished to benefit. As to the communication of doctrinal knowledge, he did not doubt that much was imparted to the children who resorted to our schools and received our instructions. As to the children who, after they grow up, quit us, of whom we see and hear nothing more, he believed we often needlessly discouraged ourselves. Let us be assured there often is the result, though we are not always permitted to see it. We have only to work in faith, assured that all is right, whether or not we see the immediate fruits of our labours. He had been connected with this Association from its birth, and had been present at all its meetings. He had never witnessed an anniversary so perfectly satisfactory and encouraging as this. He thought the Society had the prospect of much usefulness before it. The appointment of Mr. Taylor as the Visitor was one from which he augured the best results. The spirit of the Society was also hopeful. The attendance that day, and the lively interest taken in the work, proved that earnestness in Sunday-school instruction was not declining, but increasing.

The CHAIRMAN enforced Mr. Glossop's recommendation that there should be teachers' classes for mutual assistance, and commended the spirit in which that gentleman recommended teachers not to distrust their work because they did not immediately reap its fruits.

Rev. JAMES DRUMMOND, being called on by the Chairman, expressed the great delight with which he had listened to Mr. Wright's address, which, however suggestive, had, he thought, almost exhausted the subject. He was glad that Mr. Wright had drawn especial attention to the fact, that if teachers would successfully communicate religious instruction, they must be themselves religious. In the teaching of science it was clear enough, that if you are to communicate knowledge, you must study it first yourself and master its principles. Many undertake to teach religion without having their own souls pervaded by its power. If our Sunday-schools are to be the centres of spiritual instruction, our teachers must become religious persons. How can they become truly religious? Various answers might be given to that question. It has been suggested that prayer-meetings may be used for this purpose. But some persons had a well-founded distaste to such meetings. There might be a religious distaste to them. Unless the soul goes heartily and devoutly into the exercise, the result will not be spiritual improvement. Mr. Drummond proceeded to urge on teachers the importance of personal devotional habits and sympathies. He discountenanced the cold, æsthetic idea that the only good result of prayer is the immediate result it produces on our own minds. The speaker then referred to the holy influences which teachers could derive from contemplating the life of Christ. The spirit and the love of Christ were the grand regenerating powers in the world. Just in proportion as teachers surrender themselves to the influences of Christ's spirit, they would become true and noble men, able to do their duty wherever it might lead them. Mr. Drummond proceeded to express his entire want of sympathy with those who treated truth as mere matter of opinion. He could scarcely regard anything as a more desolating view, than the habit which, from a fear of becoming dogmati-

cal, some men fell into, of regarding their opinions as simply their own. So far as they were merely theirs, they were worthless. Unless we can regard them as having a higher authority than our own, we cannot teach them with any power. Whatever a man justly believes, he must proclaim on an authority higher than his own individual opinion. The truth which you love and reverence is not the mere product of your own thought, but is an element of immortal truth. So far as teachers go to the work of communicating religious knowledge in this spirit, they will be efficient and successful.

Dr. MARCUS offered some suggestions on many of the topics so ably introduced by Mr. Wright, and dwelt with some force on the ungrateful duty suggested of declining the services of teachers because they were not religious men. The process involved proceedings of almost an inquisitorial character. The man not religious to-day might, by the influences which he found in the Sunday-school, become better taught religiously and spiritually, and so might become increasingly fit for his work.

The CHAIRMAN remarked that he too felt the difficulty suggested by Dr. Marcus, and that you might do good by drawing men, who were not religious, under religious influences, and so in the process of time raising their spiritual existence.

Mr. I. M. WADE made some excellent observations.

Mr. WRIGHT, having been invited by the Chairman to reply to the observations made during the discussion, said there were two points on which he desired to say a few words. It had been supposed by some of the speakers that in urging the removal from our schools of all teachers who were not religious, he advocated an inquisition into the state of mind and heart of each individual. Now he knew full well the difficulty and danger of any attempt to gauge another's devotion by our own standard; all he urged therefore was, that if there be in a school a teacher who does not profess to be religious, who is never seen at chapel, who declines to join in meetings for religious improvement, who is obviously a man without religion, it is the superintendent's duty—a painful duty, but at the same time an imperative one—to say to that man, "You are not fit for the position you hold, and I wish you to relinquish it." The other point he would advert to was the remark of one of the speakers, seconded by that of the Chairman, that if men of good moral character, but without religion, wished to become teachers, it was wise to accept their services, and to endeavour gradually to lead them to religion. From this he most decidedly dissented. Let them learn before they attempt to teach. Welcome them to the adult class, and there try to infuse religious conviction and feeling; but do not injure your scholars by setting over them men who are incapable of exerting that spiritual influence which should be put forth in every lesson, whatever its immediate subject. He believed the most fatal error Sunday-school managers could fall into would be to encourage teachers in their schools who have not felt the power of the love of God in their hearts.

A well-deserved vote of thanks to the Chairman (proposed by Rev. J. C. STREET and seconded by Mr. FREESTON) and a hymn closed the very interesting proceedings of the day.

The congregation of Dukinfield on the following Sunday celebrated the anniversary of their large and flourishing Sunday-schools; and notwithstanding rain and storms, there were very large congregations. The sermons were preached by Rev. R. Brook Aspland, M. A., and the collections amounted to about £73.

ORDINATION OF REV. JAMES C. STREET.

On Tuesday evening, March 20th, a public religious service was held in the New Bridge-Street chapel, Manchester, for the purpose of setting apart to the work of the Christian ministry the Rev. James C. Street, late of the Home Missionary College. Mr. Street has accepted the office of Superintendent Missionary of the Manchester District Unitarian Association. Although the weather was very unfavourable, a considerable congregation assembled to witness the ceremony. Many ministers and distinguished laymen from the surrounding districts were present on the occasion. The following ministers were present: Revds. J. R. Beard, D. D., Wm. Gaskell, M. A., G. H. Wells, M. A., T. E. Poynting, William Binns, C. W. Robberds, S. F. Macdonald, James C. Street, W. W. Robinson, John Beaumont, E. W. Hopkinson and James Harrop.

At seven o'clock, the Rev. W. Binns, of Birkenhead, introduced the service in an appropriate and impressive manner with a hymn, prayer, and Scripture readings taken from Isaiah lxi. and 2 Tim. ii.

After another hymn had been sung, the Rev. G. H. Wells, of Gorton, ascended the pulpit and offered up in solemn and affecting terms the dedication prayer. The choir then sung an anthem, "How lovely are thy messengers;" at the close of which the Rev. T. E. Poynting, in offering the right hand of fellowship, after a few words

of cordial welcome to his brother entering the great field of ministerial labour, added the following words of encouragement:

"Let me add encouragement, brother, to my welcome by assuring you that it *is* a noble field. There is none nobler in the world. There is none in which a man has more opportunities of exercising every noble faculty and impulse of his nature, of carrying out his noblest aspirations, of becoming the perfect man; and there is none that offers him more opportunities for rendering the most precious blessing to his fellow-creatures.

"For myself, I feel from day to day that the work is only too great, too noble, too beautiful, for my own weak capacities to come up to it; that it requires a greater elevation of mind than I can sustain,—a deeper earnestness and tenderness of soul than I can keep,—a more intense surrender of the whole being to the holiest convictions and aspirations than I can make.

"And it is this feeling of mine that admonishes me what to say to you, brother, as my best word of encouragement to you. I would encourage you, then, to enter the work with a deep feeling of its greatness and its solemnity. Allow yourself to feel how much it is above you. Such feeling will make it blessed to you, and help you to perform it worthily. Labour with energy, yet with fear and trembling, remembering that you are dealing with most sacred things,—with the deepest hopes, instincts, capacities, of your fellow-creatures,—and with the grandest realities in the universe. That feeling of the greatness and sacredness of your work will encourage you to give yourself up to all your own deepest, holiest, purest aspirations. Do not, as too many of us have done, allow your soul to be checked by finding, as you will find, too little sympathy with these aspirations. Do not be tempted to have less faith in them, to hide them in silence. Have faith in yourself, in God, and in the spiritual nature of humanity. Persevere. Utter your noblest truth, your inmost longings; and I tell you, as the result of my own experience, that at last you will often find those who chilled you with their want of sympathy at first, thanking you at last for having awakened in them new perceptions and a new life.

"One more encouragement let me speak. You will be often dismayed at the thought of the magnitude of the truths with which you have to deal in contrast with the weakness of your own powers. Men will appear to you so stolid, so indifferent, that you will long for an archangel's trump to sound the great reality to their souls, and then you will find you have but a weak human mind and voice.

"Take courage, however, in the thought that, after all, your chief work is to kindle *love* in the souls of others,—love for that which is beautiful and high and good and heavenly,—and therein love to God and love to man. All your truth is instrumental to this. And when there is an earnestness of love within the minister's own soul, there is a power therein which inspires even his fullest intellectual efforts, and runs like lightning along a conductor, although of humblest metal. As the prime source of your power, then, my brother, seek more than any learning, more than any wisdom of speech, to keep alive in your soul this fire of love,—love, I mean, for the high, the beautiful, the noble, the invisible, the eternal,—and that love trembling in your own soul will breathe through all your words and tones and acts, and mould more than all eloquence the souls you would save to yourself.

"Accept, then, these few words of encouragement, my brother, and with them the right hand of fellowship which I now most cordially offer you. Praying for the Father's blessing on your labours, may the spirit of Christ be ever with you!"

Rev. J. C. Street then replied in the following terms:

"Mr. Poynting, I thank you most cordially for the kindly welcome you have given to me on my public entrance upon the Christian ministry. I thank you for your words of encouragement. You have greeted me at the commencement of duties which for many years I have desired to undertake. Not lightly do I estimate the dignity and responsibility of an 'ambassador for Christ.' To me this office seems to be the most sacred in the world, requiring for its just performance a humble mind, a sanctified will and a well-grounded faith. When I look abroad upon the secret vice, the open sin, the doubting hearts of men; when I consider the awful gulf there is between God's requirements and man's performances; when I estimate the amount of earnest toil and holy zeal demanded to win the world to Christ, I stand in awe, and ask myself what I, with my poor powers, can do to aid the cause of truth and righteousness. I know that many holy men have consecrated the ripened powers of their richly-gifted minds to the ministry of Christ, and toiled in faithfulness amid contumely and scorn, and I feel but ill prepared to join their sacred ranks. It is only when I remember that God employs the weak things of the world to do His holy services, that I feel strengthened in my decision to devote my feeble faculties

of mind and heart to the ministry of the everlasting gospel. This gospel is to me a grand reality which clings around the living presence of Christ. To me it has been a message of love; I would make it a message of love to others. Not wrath, but love, is the burden of its message. Treasuring deeply in my heart its rich provisions of mercy, peace and joy,—fortified by the assurance that God will give His blessing to every faithful labourer in His vineyard,—strengthened by the confident hope that the sympathy and co-operation of my fathers and brothers in the ministry will not be withheld,—and believing that now, as of old, the people will listen gladly to the word of life,—I enter with hopeful zeal upon the glorious work into which you have this night so kindly welcomed me. On the towers of Zion would I take my stand, and strive to become a faithful watchman. Against the hosts of sin and evil, of error and prejudice, of intolerance and bigotry, may I 'war a good warfare,' and through good report and evil report approve myself a good soldier of Jesus Christ. I pray that He who has given me the desire to enter this sacred ministry, may sustain me in the midst of its trials and its privileges; that in its preparations and watchings and conflict, I may remember that I am surrounded with fathers and brothers who have borne the 'heat and burden of the day' and are yet 'fighting the good fight;' and that I may be assured that the great Captain of our salvation will lead us all to final victory. Once more I thank you for your cordial welcome."

The Rev. J. R. Beard, D.D., then entered the pulpit and delivered the charge to the young minister. His text was taken from 1 Corinthians i. 17, "For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel." He said, "My Christian brother, the goodly confession which you have just made before many witnesses, might exempt me from the necessity of saying anything to charge you upon this occasion; but a duty has been assigned to me, and, however supererogatory that duty may be, I must attempt to discharge it.

"Paul meant, in the text, that Christ sent him not so much to baptize as to preach the gospel. Baptism and the gospel are related the one to the other; they are related as means to an end." The Dr. then arranged his subject into three divisions, and proceeded with considerable power and fervour to develop them. His remarks specially bore on the field in which the minister had to work, the kind of work he would have to do, and the manner in *which he* would best be able to do it. There was a class of pursuits with which the minister of Christ must not meddle at all, or meddle but sparingly; they were such as had no bearing on the work of the ministry. All the higher necessities and nobler engagements of life were connected one with the other, and contributed to the development of our nature and the advancement of society. The minister must to a great extent deny himself the pleasures of scientific research, and make it his meat and his drink to preach the gospel. As Christ frequented not the house of the high-priest but the house of the tax-gatherer,—so he, if he made the pulpit his throne and the study his retreat, must make the cottage his place of constant resort. After developing in a masterly way the apostolic thought in the text, the Dr. directed his remarks more especially by way of advice to the young minister. He said, "Besides preaching the gospel exclusively and positively, you must preach it distinctively. A gospel which is not distinctive is no gospel at all. I entreat you to preach the gospel of Christ. The child was right when he said that to be good and to do good seemed to him to be the whole of religion. To be and to do are the soul and substance of Christianity. These were the ends which Christ sought: let these be the ends which you seek. Endeavour first and last to bring men into deep and living sympathy with Christ, that so they may live in union with their fellow-men, in harmony with the injunctions of the gospel, and in perfect submission to the will of God. You cannot hope for success unless you as a preacher, so far as you may, follow the example of the Great Teacher himself. What course was taken by him who knew the human heart so well, the evangelist Mark answers in these words: 'Jesus came into Galilee preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent ye, and believe the gospel.' It is your duty to imitate Christ by bearing these words into the world. The theme of your preaching must be, 'Repent ye, and believe the gospel.' Repentance is needed now as much as it was in the time of Christ. The true Christian is he who strives in reality to live the Christian life. He never ceases to repent. So long as I sin, I hope God will give me a repentant heart. What I need, others need; if others need repentance as much as I need it, they need also to have repentance preached. Therefore do I charge you, be faithful to your duty. Christ places repentance before belief. He that worships mammon debases his nature until he has neither the power to believe

nor to repent, and he that worships self in any form is an idolator. Therefore preach repentance, and that you may preach it effectively, preserve constantly a contrite and lowly heart yourself. How supremely ridiculous is it for the self-satisfied man to preach repentance; preach repentance he cannot unless he repents himself. May you know, my Christian brother, in your own deep and varied experience the great import of the words, 'Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.' Go forth and say to every one, 'Repent and believe the gospel;' make conversion, in the true sense of the word, your great aim. May the spirit of God go with you; may it abide in your soul, and make you wise and strong in your work! Guard yourself and walk whither you will, and when you are old you will not be led whither you will not."

Rev. W. GASKELL, M.A., then delivered the charge to the congregation, from Jude i. 3.

After touching on the difficulty which was often experienced in reconciling zeal with liberality, and pointing out on what principles this was to be done, he reminded his hearers that the exhortation of the text was addressed, not to any particular class in the church, but to believers in general, and illustrated and enforced it by a reference to various other apostolic admonitions. He maintained that Christians in the present day were bound to contend for the faith just as earnestly as those of the first age; and shewed how each one might do this most effectively by the persuasive power of a beautiful example, by making use of the opportunities afforded in the home circle and the intercourses of friendship, by not neglecting the services of Christian worship, by bearing an open and consistent testimony to the worth of the gospel, by clearing away obstacles to its progress, and helping to diffuse a wholesome Christian literature. But in addition to thus making his individual influence felt, there were Christian works requiring the power of association, by joining in carrying on which he might most effectively "contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints." Such was the case with that which they were then inaugurating. It required them to unite their scattered energies and strengthen each others' hands for the promotion of a great and holy object, which had not yet had from them the attention which it should have had. He then dwelt on what seemed to him their special duties in regard to it. He believed the way had now become clear, through the fidelity of the early champions of Unitarianism, for setting it forth in a manner to engage the attention of men such as had never been presented before, and that what they had to do was to display it in all its simplicity and victorious reasonableness and beauty. This was the kind of work which they were about to take up, and which, if they only brought to it the right spirit and energy, was sure of success. He was sure that the young friend who had that night consecrated himself to it, would give himself to it with all zeal and earnestness; and he called upon every one who felt an interest in his work, as he trusted they all did, to aid him by their sympathy and encouragement, and every way in which they could.

This is but a brief outline of the Rev. gentleman's address, which was marked by distinguished excellence, and was delivered with masterly eloquence and power.

A hymn was then sung, commencing,

"A charge to keep I have,
A God to glorify,
A never-dying soul to save,
And fit it for the sky."

After which the Rev. W. Gaskell concluded the interesting service, which had occupied upwards of two hours and a half, by pronouncing a benediction.

TRIBUTE OF RESPECT TO A MINISTER.

Among the prosperous Unitarian congregations in South Lancashire, that of Bank Street, Bolton, holds a conspicuous place. Its present minister, Rev. Franklin Baker, M.A., has presided over the congregation since the close of the year 1823. The completion of the 30th year of his useful pastorate was marked by the commencement of the erection of a beautiful chapel on the site of the ancient Presbyterian meeting-house in Bank Street. That chapel cost upwards of £4000. It was not cleared of debt at the time of the opening in 1856; but during the past year a final and successful effort has been made to free the chapel from its liabilities; and at the annual meeting of the congregation held on the 30th of March, the Treasurer, Mr. Alderman Heywood, had the gratifying duty of announcing to the members, that instead of a balance against the society of more than £500 (for so the account stood last year), there was a balance in hand of £22. 18*s*. — The congregational meeting was held in the convenient schoolrooms under the chapel, and business and sociality were happily combined in a tea party, the arrangements for which were more than usually bountiful and handsome. The minister presided. The statement of accounts called forth an appropriate speech of congratulation from Joseph Crook, Esq.,

M.P., one of the Members of the borough. A resolution followed, acknowledging the invaluable services of the Treasurer, and also those of Mr. Scowcroft, who had greatly assisted him in the pecuniary affairs of the congregation during and since the building. Mr. Alderman Heywood then addressed the congregation on the services rendered them for more than thirty-six years by their respected pastor. He alluded also in delicate and respectful terms to the amiable character and uniform kindness of the minister's lady; and in conclusion presented Mr. Baker with two handsome silver salvers (with an inscription) and a purse of 100 guineas, as a token of the respect and esteem in which his valuable and efficient services were held by his flock. Mr. Councillor Harwood presented the minister with a handsome volume containing the autographs of the donors, more than 120 in number. The superintendents of the Sunday-school presented an address expressive of respect and gratitude to Mr. and Mrs. Baker, and to the latter a beautiful ebony workbox inlaid with pearl. An address from the Sunday scholars in the two classes immediately under the care of Mr. and Mrs. Baker was also presented to them.—Mr. Baker acknowledged these interesting complimentary offerings in several addresses, and intimated his intention of employing the money placed in his hands on a congregational object he had at heart. Being pressed by his friends to expend it in a journey with a view of recruiting his own and his lady's health, he intimated his purpose to leave them for a short time with that object, but firmly declined to apply the money portion of their handsome gift to any but a strictly congregational purpose, and intimated his intention of increasing the amount. — Proceedings of this kind are very gratifying, and are honourable alike to the pastor and the flock.

SOUTHERN UNITARIAN FUND SOCIETY.

The anniversary of the Southern Unitarian Fund Society was held on Good Friday, April 6th, at the High-Street chapel, Portsmouth. The Rev. S. Bache preached a sermon appropriate to the day and to the occasion of the meeting, from John xviii. 36, "Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence." Mr. Bache shewed that the great object of Christ's mission was to establish a spiritual *kingdom*, and pointed out how infinitely the goodness of God surpasses the expectations of men, illustrating his position from the gift of the Messiah and the circumstances of ordinary life. He then shewed the obligation to maintain the truth and spirituality of religion, and the tendency of orthodoxy to subvert both by its faith in a metaphysical Deity, in the doctrine of Atonement, and the worship of Christ.

At the close of the service, the Rev. H. Hawkes was called to the chair for the business meeting; and the Rev. E. Kell read the report of the Society, which embraced reports from the various congregations in the district, some of which were of considerable interest, and from them a few extracts may be given.

The report from Portsmouth stated that during the year the congregation had had two courses of lectures on Sunday evenings —one by different ministers, amounting to seven, and the other by their own pastor, numbering eight. Both courses had been publicly announced weekly, and had been well attended. There had been established this year a prayer-meeting and Bible class on alternate Friday evenings. The Sunday-schools were going on healthily. The teachers had established a Bible class for boys who had become too old to be retained in the schools as scholars. The report stated that by the easy means of a shilling a month's subscription, fifty copies of Kitto's Family Bible had found a place in the homes of the congregation; also that the John Pounds' Library had received many valuable contributions during the year, amongst which was a gift of £3. 12*s.* 6*d.* from friends in London, chiefly connected with the Rev. W. Forster's congregation in Kentish Town. The donations to the Benevolent Society had this year been larger in amount than those of any previous year.

The report from Reading gave an interesting statistical account of the attendance at this infant church, and mentioned that a member of the congregation, lately deceased, Miss Slaughter, had left a legacy of £10 to assist in discharging the expenses of a course of monthly lectures. These lectures had been carried on under the superintendence of the Southern Unitarian Fund Society, by the Revds. E. Kell, W. Odgers, E. Talbot, H. Hawkes and R. Shelley.

The report from Poole stated that since the last year they had strengthened their position as a congregation in the town by the establishment of evening classes for young men. These classes commenced this winter, assemble five evenings in the week, and are well attended. "The instruction given comprises history, geography and

grammar, in addition to writing and arithmetic. The young men who avail themselves of the instruction thus given, belong to various sections of the Christian church, and have given a substantial proof of their gratitude by a present of a handsome timepiece to the Rev. M. Rowntree. These classes are held in a large room connected with the chapel, but distinct from the school-room. In the latter, poor children, boys and girls, assemble as before for evening instruction. In this department our numbers flourish. We have been able, through the kind offer of a lady, to devote two hours three days in the week to the instruction of poor girls, for whom we open the school-room in the mornings, and some attending in the evening avail themselves of this additional privilege. These efforts, unpretending as they are and wholly unsectarian, are not without their good effect on our congregational services."

The report from Newbury stated that during the past year a course of lectures on Sunday evenings on Ecclesiastical Biography (comprising the names of Arius, Servetus, Socinus, Lindsey, Priestley and Channing) drew together a good many strangers, who seemed interested. The Thursday evening service had been regularly kept up. Courses of lectures on the Missionary Journeys of St. Paul and on the Church of England were given at these meetings. During the year several tea-meetings had been held, at which reading interesting books and conversation thereon had made an agreeable and useful change. "The Tract and District Visiting Society is flourishing, considering our means. Notwithstanding the strenuous endeavours of the Church visitors to prevent the people from reading our books, they are sought after with avidity and generally liked. We have to regret great difficulty in obtaining sufficient tracts of a suitable character for distribution. Any member of our church with means and leisure who would set himself to remedy this not very creditable defect in our literature, would be a benefactor to our body and to the world. Our Sunday-school continues to increase in numbers and to improve in efficiency. The week-evening classes on Wednesday and Thursday number 14 scholars, and their attendance is regular and satisfactory. The course of teaching is made as doctrinal as the capacities of the pupils will allow. It is considered to be a duty to lead the young to the adoption of Unitarian principles, and if possible to attach them from conviction to the church in which those principles are professed. Efforts have been made during the year to improve the appearance of the chapel and grounds."

The report from Wareham states that, "there has been an evening class once a week commenced for teaching the boys of the Sunday-school writing and arithmetic; also that the minister's house, which was building at our last annual meeting, is finished, and has been occupied the last nine months. It is a good house, and in a very pleasant and healthy situation."

The report from Southampton stated that the congregation had now realized its long-cherished desire of removing from the old Methodist chapel, which had become exceedingly noisy and disagreeable from the multiplication of gin-palaces and beer-shops in its neighbourhood, and had erected a new church on a more eligible spot. This site had been purchased in anticipation of the new building two years previously, and was thus obtained at a less cost. The expense of the erection of the church had considerably exceeded the original intention, but the congregation had been stimulated by the advice of ministers and friends from a distance, to erect an edifice which should be equal, not only to present emergencies, but worthy of the glorious object for which it was raised. The report dwelt on the details attending the opening of the new church, and after expressing gratitude to the Supreme Bestower of all, and to distant friends for their generous donations, concluded with the earnest prayer—"May the gifts, the blessing, the sympathy, we have received, stimulate us to the acquisition of more of that heart piety, that spirit of self-sacrifice and devotion to our God and Father, which shall be best promotive of His glory and honour, and make us more one in *Him*—His children, indeed—brethren in Christ Jesus!"

After the report had been read, Mr. Pines moved and Mr. Pond seconded its adoption.

B. W. Carter, Esq., moved and Mr. Redward seconded the cordial thanks of the meeting to the Rev. S. Bache for his truly appropriate discourse.

Rev. E. Kell moved, and Lieut. Millar seconded, that "This meeting records its continued opposition to Church-rates, and instructs its Chairman and the other officers of the Society to draw up, sign, and send Petitions for their abolition to both Houses of Parliament."

Routine resolutions were moved by the Rev. H. E. Howse, Mr. Simpson, of Southampton, and other friends.

In the evening, the Society and its friends took tea in the large school-room of the High-Street chapel, at which Mrs. Eveleigh presided. B. W. Carter, Esq., afterwards took the chair, and proposed the following sentiments: "The Queen."

"Our best wishes for the advancing interests of the Southern Unitarian Fund Society"—responded to by Mr. Kell.

"Health and happiness to the Rev. S. Bache, with thanks for his excellent services"—responded to by Mr. Bache.

"Prosperity to the High-Street Congregation"—spoken to by Mr. Redward, the Secretary.

"Civil and Religious Liberty all the world over"—responded to by Rev. H. Hawkes.

"Our hearty congratulations to the Unitarian Christian Congregation at Southampton on the erection of their beautiful Church, and our ardent wishes for their growth in Christ"—responded to by Mr. Kell; who in concluding proposed, "That this meeting desires to record its deep sense of the heavy loss our religious community has recently sustained in the death of the Rev. George Harris, the Rev. Benjamin Carpenter and the Rev. Dr. Hutton, whose varied and eminent services to the church and to society have entitled them to its profound respect and lasting gratitude. It humbly prays the great Lord of the harvest that such examples of fervent piety, devoted zeal and active benevolence, may be instrumental in stimulating the labourers in the Christian vineyard who yet survive to renewed activity and zeal, and tenders to the mourning relatives of the departed its sincere sympathy under their bereavement."

Rev. H. E. Howse seconded the resolution, which was unanimously adopted.

The next sentiment, "Our cordial sympathy with the General Baptists, the Pioneers of Christian Truth and Freedom in the olden time," was spoken to by the Rev. Thomas Foster.

"Thanks to the Stewards" was responded to by Mr. Tarrang; and "Thanks to the Chairman" was carried by acclamation.

Several hymns were sung in the course of the evening, and this interesting meeting was closed with prayer by the Rev. Samuel Bache.

E. K.

UNITARIAN HOME MISSIONARY BOARD.

From the fifth report of the Unitarian Home Missionary Board we glean a few facts which will serve to illustrate the aim, spirit and actual working of the Institution. The account of the last examination, given in our March number, sufficiently shews how wide, as well as thorough, is the mental discipline through which the tutors conduct their pupils; the statistical summary subjoined proves most fully that benevolent and religious work is combined with study, and, we must add, to an extent that antecedently we should almost have thought impossible. The facts here presented in totals are given only (or mainly) in details in the report. In future reports we hope to see the sum-totals added. The statements cover a period of twelve months, and take in the active labours of thirteen students.

Total persons above 15 years of age ministered to in sermons, addresses, visits and other religious services	65,849
Total services by 13 students	1,587
Average services by each student	122
Voluntary and cottage services	75
Pulpits supplied	64
—— of regular congregations	45
—— mission stations	19
Services at two or more places the same Sunday by the same students	41

In regard to the large number of 65,849 persons ministered to, it must be stated in explanation that this is the gross number as shewn in the books kept by the Principal; of course during the year very many persons, attending repeatedly, are repeatedly reckoned. The Committee invite attention to the fact that, as appears in the last item, it has been found necessary one-and-forty times to send the same student to two places. Sometimes one student, we are informed, has had to do duty at three separate places. Instances have occurred in which the two places at which the same student officiated were 20 miles distant from each other. The necessity for this exertion has arisen from the number of the students being unequal to the work required at their hands. During the current year the disproportion, we believe, will be greater. Truly is the harvest great and the labourers few. May the Lord of the harvest send more labourers into his harvest!

MARRIAGES.

April 3, at St. John's church, Clifton, WILLIAM CHARLES MACREADY, Esq., of Sherborne House, Sherborne, to CECILE LOUISE FREDERICA, fourth daughter of the *late Henry* SPENCER, Esq.

April 12, at St. Nicholas-Street chapel, Lancaster, by Rev. H. Solly, Mr. RICHARD SMALLEY to ELIZA JANE, youngest daughter of the late Adam THORNBOROW, Esq., of that town.

OBITUARY.

February 16, at Bury St. Edmunds, in his 91st year, THOMAS ROBINSON, Esq. Among the laymen who professed Unitarianism in the county of Suffolk, Mr. Robinson long filled the first place; but his personal influence was devoted rather to the last than the present generation, and to the concerns mainly of his native town, in which his whole life was spent. We have not space to advert to those of a close borough, except in their relation to that triumph of civil and religious liberty which marked the last age. Mr. Robinson belonged to a family of Dissenters both on the father's and mother's side. His father's family for several generations and in collateral branches had been tanners in the county of Suffolk. To this he was himself bred; but he soon retired from business, for which he had no taste, and was willing to live unoccupied, until the great political change in the country enabled him to take his proper part in public matters.

He was educated by his mother's younger brother, the Rev. Habakkuk Crabb, from whom his mind took its peculiar character and religious opinions, and to which he faithfully adhered.

Mr. Crabb had been trained at the Daventry Academy, and when young in the ministry had partaken of the impulse so widely spread by the writings of Price and Priestley. Like many of that generation who made no open profession of extreme opinions, which were considered as incompatible with occupying one of the old pulpits, and being a man of strong domestic and family attachments, he rejoiced in an invitation to Wattisfield, in Suffolk, the place of his birth, and where most of his relations dwelt, on the death of the Rev. Thomas Harmer.* It was, however, soon discovered that he had imbibed too copiously of the new opinions, and he was happy in finding a retreat at Royston, in Herts, where he met with congenial friends in the Nashes and Fordhams of that place and neighbourhood. He did not long enjoy this settlement. He survived but a few years; and he had not so far lost *caste* with the orthodox but that Robert Hall delivered an affectionate address over his grave, manifesting great personal regard, and which is appended to a posthumous volume of his Sermons. This invitation of Mr. Crabb was of more importance to his nephew than himself; for here he found in Miss Clapton, the sister of Mrs. Elias Fordham, a companion in whose society he found a full measure of domestic happiness until her death in 1826.

Mrs. Robinson brought her husband but one son, who did not enjoy the robust constitution of his father, and whose children also were doomed to an early death, living long enough to become objects of a warm affection and hopes only to be frustrated. Of the last of these, an account is given in the Christian Reformer, N.S., Vol. XII. p. 256.

Excepting in these particulars, the too frequent and almost inevitable infelicities attached to human existence, it was Mr. Robinson's privilege to lead a happy life. He was happy in himself, in his own placid and cheerful nature, in his equable temper, in his sound judgment and earnest desire to be, what he was, the instrument of rendering important service to the community in which he resided.

In the course before him, however, he had scarcely an associate among the Dissenters of the town — among those of his own opinions, none. But he found them among the liberal and enlightened Churchmen of the town and neighbourhood.

One of the chief of these was the Rev. R. E. Garnham, a Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, of whom it is enough to say that he was the *Synergus* of the well-known "Commentaries and Essays," and that his printed papers in that work extend from 1784 to 1796; he was also the author of critical papers in the Theological Repository, 1785-87. See the Monthly Magazine, XIV. p. 89. Mr. Garnham died in 1802, and appointed Mr. Robinson one of his executors. This intimacy and the executorship brought with it a familiar acquaintance with Jones and Lambert, Trinity men, — Dr. Disney, whose secession from the Church was become public, — and in general that portion of the clergy connected with Suffolk who joined in the Petition for relief from Subscription at the Feathers' Tavern. Of that movement in the Church little is now spoken. It is likely to be forgotten, perhaps because it has been succeeded by other stirrings of wider extent and more conclusive in their result. Among the residents, friends of

* The learned author of the "Observations on the Manners and Customs of the East." Mr. H. was in advance of his generation of Independent ministers in his treatment of the Old Testament; but he did not, like his successor in the same walk, Dr. Pye Smith, try too severely the patience of his clerical brethren.

Mr. Robinson, were Capel Lofft, a literary man and barrister, of singular character and rare attainments, Joshua Grigby, Jun., son of the county Member, and the Revds. Mr. Rogers, of Sproughton, and T. Kerrick, of Hornings' Heath, clergymen distinguished for their liberality and attainments. He also enjoyed the intimacy of Thomas Clarkson, the Slave-trade abolitionist, originating in a family connection with that of Mrs. Clarkson, and Dr. Malkin, Master of the King Edward Grammar-school at Bury.

At the commencement of this period, Bury was a close borough, not a monopoly, the patronage being shared by the most noble houses of Grafton (Whig) and Harvey (Tory). A considerable charity, called the *Guildhall Feoffment*, was in the hands of feoffees, all members of the corporation. Their numbers were reduced so low (only two remaining, bitter adversaries), that the trust could only be filled up by the aid of a court of law and the interposition of its officer. On this occasion Mr. Robinson rendered good service to the town by presenting a memorial to the Master, shewing that when the trust had to be filled up on a similar emergency there were three or four Dissenters named, among them his own grandfather. The two surviving trustees would nominate only their partizans. The result was, that the Master, taking counsel of the Recorder, struck out the last name from each list and substituted those of Mr. Robinson and Mr. Buck, two Dissenters, Mr. Buck being of the Independent church.

The infusion of fresh blood into an old corporation had an advantage not calculated upon, but which was signally proved. Besides a degree of publicity thus given to the proceedings of charity trustees, and party spirit being thus deprived of its unchecked power, on a future occasion a political agitator, on the opening of the borough, endeavoured to set up a case of corruption against the feoffees, and was compelled to include among the objects of his attack one at least who had no small influence among his own party. He utterly failed in every attempt to prove corruption; but his information included a demand of a new scheme for the charity, and as the feoffees desired this, it was granted, though the feoffees were confirmed in their office. But each feoffee was permitted to nominate a son as his substitute, which, with characteristic modesty and self-denial, Mr. Robinson did. Alas! he survived that son and all his grandchildren many years, reposing on the assiduous and affectionate care of that son's widow.

At an earlier period, however, Mr. Robinson had taken his place among the active assertors of the rights of free inquiry, by whose exertions the Test and Corporation Acts were repealed. His name is on the engraved list of the laymen stewards who attended the commemoration dinner, May 9th, 1828, at the Freemasons' Hall, presided over by the Duke of Sussex,—at which dinner the founder of the Christian Reformer had the reputation of having made the most eloquent speech of the day. An inspection of this list of stewards awakens painful recollections. Besides being a memorial of the principal families of active Dissenters in the kingdom, it shews how, when the victory was gained by which Dissenters of all denominations profited, it was but the signal of a fresh conflict among themselves. Mr. William Smith, the M. P. for Norwich, Deputy Chairman on this festive occasion and main instrument in obtaining the victory, and a majority of the stewards, were no longer wanted for common objects. The too notorious Lady Hewley Trust suit followed, and the loss sustained by the Presbyterians was compensated by the passing of the Dissenters' Chapels Act, a protection against a repetition of the wrong. This occasioned a separation among the Dissenters in many parts of the kingdom. Mr. Robinson had been the Treasurer of the Suffolk Benevolent Society for Dissenting Ministers, &c., an office from which he withdrew, since the objects of his especial esteem would be excluded from participation in its benefits.

Before matters had arrived at this pitch, however, he had taken his place among the magistrates of the county. When the Whigs came into power, he had reason to expect an early appointment from the confidential intimation of a friend already in the commission. It was not, however, till 1837 that the honour was conferred upon him. It was reported that a memorial against his appointment was presented by some of the clerical magistrates on account of his declared Unitarianism. Whether true or not we cannot say; but it is certain that the amenity of his manners soon conciliated all adversaries, and he in fact experienced every courtesy from his brother magistrates.

The Municipal Reform followed the Parliamentary Reform in a few years. It had the effect of taking the power out of the hands of the old corporations, in many cases to be resumed by the same persons in a few years. Mr. Robinson was placed among the borough justices from the first, and to preserve the peace of the town, which was violently agitated, at the formal application of leading Conservatives con-

sented to accept the office of Mayor in the year 1840. Indeed, as long as he retained his health, he was willing to take his share of public business. At this time, the interest which men used to take in religious controversy had turned to local politics and to Mechanics' Institutes. The activity of the middle and lower classes being turned in this direction, the chapel of necessity lost much of its ordinary influence. As already intimated, he had been long retired from public observation when his actual decease occurred. It was announced briefly, and he was spoken of with warm encomium, in the old *Bury Post*, with the more effect as the proprietor is known to be a zealous member of the Evangelical Low Church; and with more diffuse panegyric in a recently established popular paper, in an article which breathes the spirit of personal friendship, and in which his charitable disposition and kindly nature are becomingly asserted.

March 21, at Wotton, Isle of Wight, Mr. G. Brannon, aged 76.

March 24, at Liverpool, while attending the Assizes, Thomas Ayres, eldest son of the late Mr. Thomas A. Phillips, of Pendleton, near Manchester.

March 26, at Gordon Street, Gordon Square, Mary, the wife of Thos. Thornthwaite, Esq., aged 74.

March 27, at 13, Upper Phillimore Gardens, Kensington, Emma Josephine, wife of Frank Dillon, Esq., aged 38.

March 28, at Leicester, after a protracted illness, Isabella, youngest daughter of the late Rev. Edward Higginson, of Derby.

March 29, cut off in the prime of life, Jane, the beloved wife of Dr. Bingley, of Whitley Hall, Ecclesfield, Yorkshire, and daughter of the late Rev. N. Philipps, D.D., of Moor Lodge, near Sheffield. Like her father, she possessed those characteristics which endeared her to a numerous circle of friends and secured their affectionate regard and esteem; and as a daughter, a sister and the mother of a family, she set a bright example of domestic virtues, united to an accomplished mind. Although her earthly career has terminated, of her it truly may be said, with the recollections of the past and in the hopes of the future, "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord: they cease from their labours and their works do follow them!"

April 2, Isabella Mary, eldest daughter of Mr. James Cornell, of Well Street, Hackney.

April 2, at Edinburgh, aged 38, Mary, wife of John Stevenson, Esq., and eldest daughter of Edwin John Maughan, Esq., of that city.

April 7, at 4, Cumberland Place, Regent's Park, after a few days' illness, Philip Martineau, Esq., one of the Taxing Masters of the Court of Chancery, in his 69th year.

April 7, at St. Leonard's-on-Sea, William Wills, Esq., of Park Mount, Edgbaston, aged 68 years.

The following discriminating notice of this eminent lawyer and excellent man was sent by a correspondent to the *Midland Counties and Birmingham Herald*, of Thursday, April 12.

"This week you will have to record the death of a native, and, until within the last few months, an inhabitant of this borough, whose memory will ever be held in high respect by all whose opportunities enable them to estimate his merits. I speak of Mr. William Wills, who died on Saturday last, at St. Leonard's-on-Sea. This gentleman was articled to Mr. Palmer, a respectable solicitor, of Birmingham, and while in his clerkship he established a character for a zealous and successful prosecution of his legal studies. His professional knowledge was both ample and precise, excelling in those invaluable qualities the learning of many lawyers who have attained eminence at the bar and on the bench. But Mr. Wills was anything but a mere lawyer. At an early age he imbibed an ardent love of liberty in its best meaning, including an earnest desire for the diffusion of knowledge among the people, religious, moral and intellectual, and for improvement in their material condition. Of the amendment of the law itself he was an advocate at once discreet and zealous. Having acquired by the honourable exercise of his talents a fortune more than adequate to his moderate desires, he withdrew some ten years ago from practice, and devoted much of his time to the duties of a Magistrate, his name having been added to the Commission of the Peace for Warwickshire, Birmingham and Staffordshire. His habits of mental industry enabled him, in addition to his public duties, to continue the pursuit of literature and science with more freedom from interruption, and consequently with greater profit, than was possible during his professional

career. He maintained a correspondence with many distinguished jurists at home and abroad, particularly in the United States of America. His valuable work on Circumstantial Evidence, of which at the time of his death he was preparing the third edition, is conclusive testimony of the vigour of his mind, the extent of his reading, and the conscientious accuracy of his details. His eldest son succeeded him in his own branch of the law. His second son, a distinguished graduate of the London University, is a rising member of the Midland Circuit. This young gentleman is also favourably known as an author, by his agreeable 'Narrative of his Exploring Adventures among the Alps.' His only daughter is married to our townsman, Dr. Russell. Of the strength of his domestic affections, and the steady warmth of his friendships, your correspondent could say much from an experience of more than forty years. But deferring to what he knows would be the wishes of the departed (could wishes now be entertained), on that topic he will not enter."

To this honourable testimony of the friend "of more than forty years," it may be added that Mr. Wills was through life a firm, consistent and liberal supporter of the principles of Protestant Dissent, the continued recognition of which in the Free Grammar School of his native town he was greatly instrumental in maintaining when, thirty years ago, he acted as the solicitor on behalf of the petitioners against an attempt which was then made to restrict to members of the Established Church the government of that very important Institution.* Nor less consistently and liberally did he contribute to the support of Unitarian Christian worship in connection with the congregation assembling in the New Meeting-house, of which he was a member. Sincere and earnest, without ostentation, his presence and sympathy were ever highly valued by his fellow-worshipers, and his effectual co-operation in every benevolent and Christian work might be confidently relied on. Earnest were the hopes entertained that he might return and resume his place among us when the severe season had passed, and that for many years yet to come we might enjoy the pleasure and benefit of his wise counsels, his intellectual conversation and his friendly sympathy.

* See Monthly Repository, New Series, 1831, Vol. V. pp. 68—72.

But the Great Disposer of events had otherwise ordained. His life terminated suddenly as peacefully in the place of his winter sojourn, and his remains were interred by his friend and pastor in the cemetery at Hastings, accompanied by his sons, and by one to whom he had generously supplied a father's place.

His unexpected removal spared him a trial which, considering his feeble state of health and the nature of the disease of which he died, might not improbably have induced the same result. But five days after the last rites had been paid to him, his family were again startled and distressed by the death of a daughter-in-law whom he tenderly loved, LUCY, the wife of his second son, Mr. Alfred WILLS, who died on Tuesday, April 17, in the 28th year of her age, after an hour's illness, at Foxholes, Walton Heath, Surrey, the house of her mother, Mrs. George Martineau, whither she had gone to stay during her husband's absence from home. Her intelligence, sound judgment and graceful accomplishments, her gentle manners and affectionate disposition, her sweetness as a daughter, a sister, a wife and a mother, had endeared her not only to the subject of this memoir but to every member of his family; and her early death, before the prime of life was well reached, has left a blank in many a home besides the one which is now deprived of its light and its pride.

Under these and all such bereavements, how consolatory is the sublime assurance of the voice from heaven, "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord: they rest from their labours and their works do follow them"!

April 9, at Thorne, Yorkshire, SARAH GARLAND, wife of the Rev. James Cauty SMITH, in her 51st year; and on April 12, aged 51, Rev. JAMES CAUTY SMITH, the Unitarian minister at Thorne.

April 10, in the 46th year of his age, CHARLES NATHANIEL BOLINGBROKE, Esq., of Norwich.

April 10, at Ringwood, ELIZABETH, widow of the late John CONWAY, Esq., aged 87.

April 12, at 5, Blandford Square, in the 77th year of his age, BENJAMIN [illegible], Esq., formerly M.P. for Norwich.

THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CLXXXVI.] JUNE, 1860. [Vol. XVI.

CHRISTIAN MISSIONS IN INDIA AND THE RELIGIOUS CONDITION OF THE HINDOOS.

THE ADDRESS DELIVERED AT A MEETING OF THE LONDON DISTRICT UNITARIAN SOCIETY, HELD AT RADLEY'S HOTEL, FEBRUARY 24, 1860.

BY MR. HODGSON PRATT.

THROUGHOUT the whole period of the Catholic era, efforts were not wanting to continue the work of preaching to the heathen in non-christian countries, although the mode adopted became more and more corrupt as the doctrines of Christ became more and more disguised by human inventions and perverted to low purposes. I need hardly go into the historical part of this question, or seek to inquire into the great mystery of the check which the propagation of Christianity met with in Asia,—of the disappearance of whole churches established during the first centuries, and of their submersion in the wave of Mahommedanism. That the rapid corruption of Christian doctrine which especially distinguished the Eastern churches had much to do with the success of Islam, we cannot doubt, any more than we can doubt that the influence of the Koran was in many respects most beneficial, and an immense step from the idolatry of the Asiatic nations where it chiefly prevailed. But whether it has rendered those nations more fitted for the reception of Christian teaching may well be doubted. Success in preaching Christianity among the Mahommedans is as rare as among the Jews. Some progress, as I hope to shew, is being effected among the Hindoos as well as among the Burmese, in the South Seas, the Pacific and elsewhere; but wherever Mahommedanism is found in Asia, there appears to be a dead check to the efforts of our missionaries. Decaying as is the temporal power upon which the spiritual vitality of Islam was supposed to rest, it still spreads in the Straits, the Eastern Archipelago, and the lower castes of India, more especially those without the pale of Hindooism. Notwithstanding much discouragement, the great mass of the Christian world has not doubted that it was their duty to persevere in making Christ's message known to the heathen. That the corruptions of Christianity, and the mistaken modes in which men have sought to communicate that message, have interfered with missionary success, is not a reason for abandoning the attempt. Liberal Chris-

tians may not have the object which has animated the promoters of missions generally, but surely they have another object quite as great. They may not be spurred on by the feeling that the soul of every man, woman and child, not converted, will be doomed to eternal misery. They must, however, feel that every soul not brought to the knowledge of God, as revealed in Christ, is deprived of the surest means of happiness here and hereafter, —is deprived of strength to resist sin, and of consolation in affliction,—is condemned to appear on the shores of the next world in a state unfitted for the highest communion with God, whatever may be the ultimate result. For a long time Protestants were too much engaged in strengthening their own position, and in the internal battles of sect and theology which arose out of the Reformation, to think much of foreign missions. It is curious, in reading the life of William Carey, the first Bengal missionary, to find how few there were at that time to second his attempt,—how much of actual discouragement and disapproval was expressed not only by worldly laymen, but by the highest authorities in the Church. The East-India Company has incurred much obloquy for the obstacles they threw in the way of the first missionaries; but they represented only too faithfully the spirit of the day, when the celebrated tea-merchant, Mr. Twining, protested against what he called the *sanguinary* proposal, that missionaries should be sent to convert the Hindoos, and when others lauded the Hindoo religion to the skies as a model of everything grand and elevating. Even in the recollection of those now living, the moderate and excellent men who were the leading spirits of the "Clapham sect" were ridiculed as ignorant fanatics, and Sydney Smith could only find a subject for contempt and sarcasm in the life and labours of such a man as William Carey. It is a singular fact that when the subject was debated in the House of Commons, among the few who advocated the policy of allowing the missionaries unrestricted admission to India, Mr. Smith, the Member for Norwich, a Unitarian, if I mistake not, was to be found holding a foremost place. But during the sixty years that have expired since the "inspired cobbler," as Sydney Smith called him, was wearily begging for subscriptions from house to house to defray his voyage to Bengal, a great change has taken place; and there are now about 400 Protestant missionaries in Hindostan; while England spends £150,000 a-year on that cause. There is, however, one Protestant denomination which may be said to have done nothing in this great field of labour, viz., the Unitarian denomination; and I shall to-night endeavour to remove some of the prejudices which have, I believe, prevailed among Liberal Christians on the subject of foreign missions. It will also be my duty to lay before you certain considerations regarding the character of Unitarian theology and *preaching*, in order that you may see whether Unitarian mission-

ıries would be likely to meet with greater or less success than he missionaries of other churches.

I will endeavour to shew, in the first place, *what have been the actual results* of missionary labour in India. As to mere tangible and visible results, so far as this can be expressed numerically, I may mention that the native converts to Protestant Christianity at the present time are 120,000 in number. Nearly the whole of these belong to the poorest and humblest classes of society, such as the palm-tree cultivators of Tinnevelly, or the ploughmen of Kishnaghur, in Bengal. A common term of reproach is used in reference to this class, that of *Rice Christians*,—the insinuation being that they are persons professing Christianity for the sake of the support in the shape of rice which they get from the missionaries. How much this may have been the case at one time, I am not prepared to say; but the charge would be most untrue if applied to the native Christians of the present day. This impression probably had its origin in certain circumstances which occurred rather more than twenty years ago in Kishnaghur, a district of Lower Bengal. A famine prevailed, and several hundred families in a state of starvation came of their own accord to the missionaries stationed in the district, entreating them for food and support, and offering to remain for ever under their care and to be educated as Christians. The offer was not rejected. These people were of the very poorest and least educated class,—ploughmen and peasants,—and would have misunderstood any hesitation on the part of the missionaries to accept their proposal. And when once the step was taken, *caste* was irrecoverably lost, and there could be no return. The missionaries felt that, however little they might be able to effect in raising the character of the parents, much might be done with the young children, and that each generation would probably shew an improvement over that which preceded it. Land was accordingly purchased at several places in the district for the settlement of these people and for the erection of their houses. I have visited these villages, and I was very much struck with the general air of quiet, cleanliness and order, both in the houses and adjoining plots, as compared with what prevailed in the villages of the Hindoos and Mahommedans around. Each of the Christian villages has a house for the English or German missionary, good schools for the children, and an English church. However low may have been the motive which led these men in the first instance to adopt the Christian name, it would be very unfair to charge the missionaries with having resorted to bribery to induce them to take this step. And their case is not that of converts elsewhere. In Tinnevelly and the adjoining districts of Southern India, the converts are reckoned at 80,000,—the result of genuine and unimpeachable exertions on the part of the missionaries. Native

Christians of this class doubtless derive some advantages from their change of religion, but these advantages are the natural and necessary result of their Christianity. So far from their being paid to remain under the influence of the missionaries, they are expected to contribute, and do contribute largely, towards the support of their churches and schools. In Burmah, as you have probably heard, our recent acquisition of Pegu has resulted in several thousands of the Karen tribe proclaiming their belief in Christ, in accordance, they say, with an old tradition that they should receive their religion from strangers coming across the sea. These Karens have actually refused to receive help in the establishment of their schools, offering to support both schools and Christian preachers by their own exertions. In Tinnevelly, where Christianity has made far greater progress than in any other part of India, the fact is probably owing, Dr. Caldwell says, to the little tenacity which the *demon-worship* of these indigenous races appears to have, in comparison with the Hindooism and Mahommedanism which prevail in the rest of India. These people appear to have gladly sought in Christianity a relief from the gloomy and terrific influence of demonolatry. The worldly advantages which the native Christians of this class derive from their change of creed must, however, be admitted,—such as the affectionate care of the European missionary, in whom they find a friend, a counsellor and a physician. They are taught and helped to establish funds for the widows and orphans of the community, and to support Savings' Banks; so that instead of being in a state of miserable indebtedness to money-lenders, like the most part of the native rural population, in daily fear of being turned out of their holdings for non-payment of rent, they are led to habits of thrift and economy. The police and the native landlords think twice before they rob and oppress them, for fear lest the missionary may report the fact to the magistrate. No wonder, then, that where Christianity has not had to contend with the Hindoo or Mahommedan faith, the missionaries should have made fair progress.

So much for numerical results. It is a more difficult thing to estimate the value and quality of the Christianity nominally professed by this or any other class. We may reasonably hope that with every successive generation brought up under the Christian influences of the school and chapel, the standard of life and feeling will gradually rise. The habits of centuries are surely to some extent hereditary, and cannot be entirely overcome in one or two generations. Why is sin so strong in our own land, but from this fact? Why is it, but for the fact of mental and moral qualities being hereditary, that in our native schools in India, open as they are to all castes, the boys of the brahmin or priest class, descended for centuries from readers and thinkers, generally carry off the *prizes?* Besides, do we utterly despair of the efforts of our home

missionaries because we often find that worldly motives are at work among our own heathen,—that both men and women attend church more frequently about the time that a small loan or a present of clothes and blankets would be welcome? No; we are content if, through much that is evil, we can gradually and imperfectly lead men into habits of Christian observance, into the influences of Christian worship, so that imperceptibly their hearts may in some degree be influenced at last. We do not say to our poor, degraded fellow-men and women at home, "Be everything that is pure and perfect, or be nothing." Could we say so to ourselves? So, doubtless, I have often heard the missionaries speak in very desponding terms regarding these native Christians of Kishnaghur, the descendants of the famine-stricken, and I could tell you many discouraging things about them; but to what purpose? I prefer to tell you that I saw much of these men when I raised a company of military police among them for the defence of my district during the year of the mutiny; and that my own impression was decidedly that, on the whole, they were more trustworthy, more conscientious and more simple-minded than the Hindoo and Mahommedan peasants around them of the class to which they belonged.

But speaking generally of the great mass of the Hindoo and Mahommedan population of India, little or no impression has been made in the direction of Christianity. Among the Mahommedans, indeed, we see no prospect even of progress. They stand aloof not only from our religion, but even from our *secular* schools and colleges. When the Government made scholastic distinction the passport to the public service and to honourable and well-remunerated employment, the Mussulmans refused the bait so eagerly seized by the Hindoos; so that year by year a smaller number is to be seen in the service of the Government, their places being at once occupied by the industrious and versatile Hindoos. To the Mahommedans, our religion, our learning, our language, our government, all are alike hateful. As to the Hindoos (I mean the uneducated masses), you must bear in mind how much strength the Brahminical system derives from its intimate association with the whole framework of society,—with the daily existence of the population,—so that every act and engagement, whether of work or recreation, is a religious ceremony; from its providing every man with a trade as his birthright, and with the privileges of the "guild" in which he was born; from the influence of a priesthood having a monopoly of learning; from a faith which on its exoteric side is attractive to the mass and has great influence over them, based as it is on an exoteric philosophy of wonderful depth and refinement, the secrets of which are locked up in the hands of the sacred few. Even the faith of Islam found a resistance in Brahminism such as it never experienced elsewhere in the East. But, fortunately,

Hindoo philosophy was inextricably mixed up with dogmas in physical science so false and absurd, that directly a Hindoo boy learns at one of our schools that the world is not flat or surrounded with seas of treacle and butter, his faith in the teaching of the priest breaks down. There is scarcely an elementary fact in geography or astronomy which does not clash with some time-honoured belief.

This leads me to speak of the progress made by the missionaries among the educated population of the large towns. About forty years ago, the Government of Bengal determined to establish public schools and colleges for the instruction of the natives in the English language and literature and the physical sciences. As regards the Hindoos, the success of the experiment was most remarkable. They shewed the greatest aptitude for the new studies, and the utmost eagerness to profit by the opportunities thus afforded them. So steadily did the standard of instruction rise, that in the course of a quarter of a century a first-rate medical college was established, from which a body of excellent surgeons has gone forth, and we have now a University where two examinations have already been held for the purpose of granting the Degree of Bachelor of Arts. "Education" is in the mouth of every Hindoo in Calcutta. It means preferment, high salaries, distinction and honour; for by it all these are made accessible. Every year Government throws open to the natives fresh posts of higher emolument and honour, making their selection from the most distinguished students of the colleges; while the increase of European trade, railways and telegraphs, create a constantly growing demand for the services of men of tolerable education. It is true that even the best students read but little after they have obtained the great object of desire, "an appointment," and that many never open an English book for the rest of their lives; yet still the good done by this general extension of European science and of English instruction is obvious. In no respect is it, to my mind, more valuable than in the fact that it affords so wide a field to the missionary. He is here no longer fettered, as he is in the interior, by the difficulty of making known Christian abstract truth through the medium of a language with which he is perhaps very imperfectly acquainted, or of preaching to a people who have no sort of mental preparation whatever. But he has here a body of about five thousand young men, speaking and writing English with the greatest fluency, whose minds have been trained to reason and reflect, and who have a general knowledge of the history and claims of Christianity, while all belief in the old idolatry and mythology has dropped away.

Of course all this has been a death-blow to polytheism and idolatry, to Hindooism in its corrupt form. When the scales *fell from* the eyes of these school-boys and college-lads, they

were intoxicated with their new light. Predominant over all other feelings was one of hatred and contempt for the superstition in which they had been brought up. They could only look with loathing upon the hideous idols that they had dressed with flowers, the Brahmin impostor at whose feet they had prostrated themselves, and the degrading social slavery in which these priests had bound them. The Principal of the Free-Church-of-Scotland College at Calcutta told me that whenever the native students had essays to write in which they could by any means drag in abuse of the Brahmins and of idolatry, they rioted in exaggerated violence, expressions of loathing and disgust, so as almost to require reproof. It is not strange that these young minds, from which had thus evaporated every particle of faith and reverence for all they had once held most sacred, should wander for a while without star or compass, and hold aloof from everything that could not be made palpable to the senses. The very name of priest and of religion became a bugbear. Discussion clubs were formed in all quarters of the town, and Tom Paine was read with avidity. At this juncture there appeared upon the scene the remarkable Scotch missionary, Alexander Duff. It was he who introduced the system of establishing English schools and colleges for the instruction of the natives in the Christian religion, along with the usual secular studies. He saw how great a demand had arisen for education, and he was determined to avail himself of it for the propagation of Christianity. As fees were demanded at the Government institutions, he offered to give free instruction at the missionary schools, on condition that the pupils should attend classes for instruction in the evidences of Christianity and biblical exegesis. The Hindoo parents were not afraid of their children becoming converts; while "Young Bengal" laughed at all religion, in whatever shape it might make its appearance. Dr. Duff's educational efforts were liberally supported by the Scotch Church, and other missionary societies have followed his example; so that about 4000 boys and young men in Calcutta alone are now receiving instruction at these missionary institutions. Others of like character have been established at Madras and Bombay. Now as to the tangible result of this expensive undertaking:—there are about 200 young men, some married, some unmarried, who out of the thousands educated at these schools have become converts at Calcutta, and about 150 more at Madras; perhaps the same number at Bombay. The number may appear small. But, in the first place, these are men whose conversion to Christianity must, from their position in native society, exercise considerable influence; and there are many hundreds more whose feelings and habits of action have been Christianized, though they may not have had the courage to avow their secret convictions. These men, unlike the peasants I before spoke of, have had everything to lose, instead of to gain,

by the change. Their worldly position as catechists, missionary school-teachers, or even as ordained preachers, is probably not so good as what they could have obtained under Government, without becoming converts at all. They have had to undergo the severest trials,—separation from their relatives, perhaps from their wives and children, persecution, abuse, and loss of home, (for you must recollect that once a Christian outcast, a man never can cross the threshold of his home again); and these are sacrifices which fall with great severity on the Hindoo of Bengal, with his sensitive nature and remarkably strong domestic attachments and his delicate regard for the feelings of his parents. When a young man of mature age and character attending one of these colleges, comes forward and asks to be baptized, he is carefully examined by the missionary for the purpose of seeing that this is no temporary ebullition of feeling, that he understands fully the magnitude of the step he proposes to take, and that he is well-grounded in religious knowledge. He then goes through a course of private reading and conversation at the missionary's house. His friends are informed of the step he proposes to take, and he is permitted to pay them a visit if he wishes, that the strength of his resolve may be thoroughly tested, and that his relatives may have every opportunity of using their influence in turning him from his purpose. This trial is often a hard one. He has to resist his mother's tears, her shrieks and entreaties; his father's threatened curses; perhaps temptations of a terrible kind, appeals to the man's lowest passions; everything is put in requisition to save the family from the terrible disgrace. I recollect hearing a very affecting anecdote of one of these converts. He was awaiting the rite of baptism and formal admission to the Christian Church, and living in the house of an English missionary. His father and other relatives were of course permitted to see him as often as they liked to come, and to use all the arguments in their power to dissuade him from the step he was about to take. At last, but two or three days remained. His father, an aged man, came for the last time to see his son. He remained many hours, exhausting every argument, appealing to every motive. Now he threatened him with personal violence in the streets; now he entreated him with tears and embraces,—at one moment reminding him of his young wife, the misery of his mother and sisters; now falling at his son's knees and imploring him; throwing himself prostrate on the ground, and kissing his feet, with all the extravagance of Eastern emotion. Then he would tempt him with promises of luxurious ease, sensual indulgence, unchecked licence, an appeal to all a man's worst passions; yet in vain; the youth remained firm, and with the self-command of manner which, as well as the extravagance of gesticulation, is so characteristic of an oriental, he betrayed *but little* emotion. But this was no want of feeling; for when

the old man was gone, the poor lad fell into a deep swoon, from which he did not recover for many hours. It will bring such trials as these more vividly before you if I give the circumstances of a case which came more directly within my own notice.

I had been for some time acquainted with a young man whom I knew to be deeply interested in the Christian message, convinced that it came direct from the Supreme Being, and that it was his duty to avow himself a follower of Christ. But he was afraid of incurring the displeasure of his friends, and he long hesitated. At last he sent me a letter, from which I take the following words: "I have just been informed that you have an appointment in your gift, which will enable me to find employment at a distance from Calcutta, where I shall be out of reach of the persecutions of my friends, and which will therefore enable me to embrace Christianity." I replied, that if I could have conscientiously granted this request, nothing would have given me greater happiness, because no happiness could be greater than that of bringing a fellow-man to the love of our Saviour and the avowal of his name. But I felt that to attempt to attain this object in the way he pointed out, would be to encourage him in a delusion. I was obliged to shew him that the distinguishing characteristic of Christianity lay in this,—that it was not so much an outward profession of belief, as a life of obedience; that there were scores of Englishmen in Calcutta who, though calling themselves Christians, were no more so than the Hindoo priests; that entire surrender of oneself, self-sacrifice in fact, was the one great test of Christianity. How then could he be in the right path, when, as the very condition of becoming a Christian, he demanded that he should be sheltered from all the sacrifice involved in the step? At the same time, I of course pointed out the unspeakable peace of mind and happiness that awaited him if he would follow where his conscience led, and leave the consequences to his Heavenly Father. I received no reply: but in two or three months I heard that he had taken the great step, and I then received a letter, from which I will read the following extract: "Under the inspiration of your letter, I have not only braved but borne the greatest amount of ill feeling that could be directed even against a Hindoo convert to Christianity. I have remained in the same village, been employed in the same office, associated with the same people, regularly corresponded, as before, with my distant brothers and sisters; and now I find the truth of the remark, *Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you.*"

The influence, in point of example, produced by the public baptism of a single convert of this class is greater than that of a hundred pariahs or low-caste men. In fact, the spirit of class and caste in this most aristocratic of nations is so strong, that acces-

sions to the ranks of Christianity from outcasts tell rather against its progress, for the people learn to look upon it as a low-caste religion. Considering what those converts suffer who come from the middle and upper classes, their sincerity, it is obvious, must be above all suspicion. Grant that there are not more than ten or twenty such men added to the Christian church in a year from all India, it is enough to prove what the Hindoo race is capable of. There never has been any doubt of their intellectual power. With such facts as we have now before us, there should not be any doubt as to their moral power and religious capacity. The 400 or 500 educated Hindoo Christians of India are a pledge of what will be, in God's own time, if we persevere and have patience in doing His work. We have no business to test progress of this sort by pure arithmetic. Judson waited six years before his labours and sufferings were rewarded with a single convert; but within thirty years more, there were 534 baptized converts and 8000 persons attending Christian worship in Burmah. In Bengal, too, the missionaries waited seventeen years for a single convert, and now there are many hundreds. Every fresh accession to the native Christian body gives courage to the numerous class who are only waiting until they have a sufficient number to keep them in countenance. The Hindoos of Lower Bengal are a timid and sensitive people, who naturally hesitate to isolate themselves from their kinsfolk and friends. If each knew how many others there were in the same position, large numbers would doubtless leave the ranks of nominal Hindooism for an open profession of Christianity. But the fear of insult and annoyance, and the dread of hurting the feelings of their parents, keep the lips of hundreds closed, who are longing to find strength for an open avowal of Christian belief. I am acquainted with the case of two brothers, each of whom had thoroughly adopted a conviction of the divine origin of Christianity with the desire of taking the Christian name; but they lived for years together without discovering that the hearts of both were bursting with the same secret, so afraid was each of telling it to the other. I believe that there are hundreds in this position, and that at some future day we shall see vast numbers taking courage to build up a great native Christian church.

I have thus endeavoured to bring before you the actual *results* of missionary enterprize in India, and I hope I have left an impression on your mind that really something has been done —perhaps we may say much—when we consider the gigantic nature of the work,—the overthrow of a religious system 3000 years old, interlaced as it is with the whole constitution of society, and based on a philosophy of deep wisdom. I hope that I have said something to disabuse Unitarians of the prejudices which they have been too prone to indulge in with reference to *the labours* of the great Protestant churches in this field. I hope

they will see how narrow and unfair a view was that presented in an article of some mark which appeared on this subject in the *Westminster Review* about three years since.

I now proceed to notice another popular error which I think has prevailed to some extent: I speak of a tendency to overrate the truth and good existing in the religions of the heathen world, and to consider them as supplying, to some considerable extent, the place which Christianity holds in Europe. I am disposed to take much the same view of these religions that I would take of the philosophic systems of ancient times. While fully admitting that they contained much that was good in tendency, there is nowhere any security for persistence in good; no strength certain to overcome temptation; no real consolation in sorrow. In the hour of trial, of sorrow and sin, of what use are the wisest guesses at truth,—the loftiest theories? Men must have absolute certainty that the Supreme God is, and that He has really spoken to His creatures directly and unmistakeably.

An exaggerated notion of the value of Hindoo philosophy has arisen in some quarters, very probably as a reaction from the ignorant and extreme denunciations for which Exeter Hall is so notorious. It would be absurd to deny the marvellous intellectual power which has been at work in developing the Sankhya, Nyaya and Vedanta systems. Their constant near approach to what we believe to be truth is perfectly tantalizing, but it is lamentable to see how utterly the great end is lost, and what injurious moral conclusions are ultimately deduced. These doctrines are no more able to bring security for good, for peace, happiness, and virtue, than were the doctrines of Plato and Pythagoras, to which they bear so marvellous an affinity. The Sankhya, in fact, denies the existence of God; the Vedanta asserts that God is identical with matter and with the human soul; while all three systems assert the doctrine of Fate, and that the dispositions of men are decreed. The soul, it is said, is a portion of the Supreme Ruler, as a spark is of fire. The relation between them is not that of master and servant, but that of whole and part. The pantheism of the Vedas is not their worst feature. Their fatalism has a more extensive and potent influence for evil. "This doctrine," says Mr. Mullens, in a valuable work just published ("Religious Aspects of Hindooism"),—"this doctrine has descended deep among the common people, and influences their conduct in every way, producing *apathy* when effort is necessary, leading them to ward off from themselves the sense of guilt when it arises from wrong-doing, by the dogma, clearly and repeatedly stated, that *God is the author of sin.* For, say the Vedas, God causeth *him* to do good deeds whom He wishes to bring out of this world; and *him* He makes to do evil deeds whom He wishes to bring *again* into the world,"—alluding to the doctrine of transmigration. Again, the Nyaya says, "The chief end of man

is the cessation of pain;" "God is without desire or aversion;" and their idea of a perfect man is also to be without desire or aversion; that sin and virtue are illusions. Here, be it remembered, we have Hindoo theology in its grand and palmy days, in its monotheistic glory, before a degraded polytheism had been developed, on its exoteric side, for the moral and intellectual bondage of the people. Doubtless there are grand and noble thoughts scattered up and down these ancient scriptures, and the most has been made of them by those who are anxious to present only the favourable side; but we must consider the pervading and distinguishing character of the theology of the Vedas, before we can form a just estimate of their influence for good or evil.

After all, religion must be tested by its fruits. We must endeavour to trace its influence on the conduct and character of the people who live under it, so far as we can trace this influence apart from that of history, locality, physique and natural bent. Such an investigation is surrounded with difficulty, and is certainly not one that I am qualified to attempt. I can only say that, with all the natural amiability and gentleness of character which distinguish at least the Hindoos of *Lower* Bengal, their essential unreliableness and untruthfulness must be in some measure ascribed to the influence of the religious dogmas which I have referred to. It seems to me that the limits of right and wrong must be confused by such teachings; that they indulge in casuistry and hair-splitting on all questions of moral duty till a clear sense of right is obliterated.

Let me now say a few words regarding that class of the native community who are supposed to exhibit the most favourable type of Hindooism,—the New-Vedantists or Reformed Brahmins of Calcutta, regarding whom Sir John Bowring wrote a short paper in the *Christian Reformer* about five years since. It must be remembered that in whatever respect these men excel the mass of their countrymen in moral strength and in their outward lives, or in their freedom from superstition, the fact is probably owing to the circumstance of their having been educated in the English schools and colleges, where the daily study of our great Christian classics, Milton, Cowper, Addison, Shakespere and Abercrombie, must have left a deep impression. I want you clearly to understand the position of the class of whom I am now speaking, viz., those natives who have by education been half Anglicized, for in every respect they form a class distinctly and widely separated from all around them. These men, by their education, their half adoption of English dress and habits, the growing use of forbidden food, their increasing desire for the society of Englishmen, have come to be regarded as apostates by the mass of their countrymen. In the eyes of the Brahmins of *the old school* they are an offence, only one degree better than

Christians and outcasts. They differ considerably among themselves, though they have general features in common. "Young Bengal" is the cognomen by which they are best known. They affect a preference for the English over the vernacular language, support several English newspapers and periodicals, and form the great body of the clerks and employés in the service of the Government and European merchants. Some of them are earnest-hearted religious inquirers, and are only waiting for a favourable opportunity to join the Christian church; others ostentatiously avow themselves to be followers of Tom Paine; while a third class are the New-Vedantists, generally men of superior education, well acquainted with the history and philosophy of their country, and possessing a strong national sentiment which disinclines them towards a "foreign" religion, as they conceive Christianity to be. They have therefore endeavoured to build up a religious school of their own, on the foundations laid by the late Rajah Rammohun Raie. They have picked out such passages from the Vedas as they can best reconcile with the conclusions of modern philosophy and the morality of our English literature. They resemble in character and position very much what we read of the New-Platonists of Alexandria, and for that reason I call them "New-Vedantists." Like the philosophers of antiquity, too many of them conform outwardly to the ceremonies of idolatrous worship, which they despise, and so deaden the conscience. They meet once a week for religious worship and for hearing portions of the Vedas read or sung; but I cannot see that they are distinguished in any degree from the rest of their class in moral courage or self-sacrificing patriotism. The educated natives, as a class, have no doubt a far higher sense of honour and a higher morality than those who belong to the old school; but that particular section of this class calling themselves Reformed Brahmins do not stand out with any special halo from among the rest. On the other hand, they have shewn a very bitter spirit towards their convert brethren. One of the most distinguished of them, a man notoriously contemptuous of superstition, and affecting the widest liberality, disinherited his son when the latter, after years of careful study, deliberately took the Christian name and was baptized. While professed lovers of free inquiry, they refused to permit the Unitarian missionary, Mr. Dall, to mention the subject of Christianity at their places of meeting, and they angrily deny that Rammohun Raie, whose followers they profess to be, believed that Christ had any specially divine authority.

New-Vedantism is in fact a movement arising out of the want of some religion felt by those educated natives who are not prepared for the sacrifices involved in an adoption of Christianity, or who are repelled by its stern demands for unreserved obedience, which selfishness and sin recoil from, and to some extent by its not being their national faith, but a foreign religion.

They dimly feel the necessity for some sort of church; so they have extemporized this half-way house; but having no belief that the Vedas are in any sense sacred and inspired, they cannot feel compelled to obey the voice of conscience when temptation comes with more than ordinary force; nor can they find consolation in the hour of real sorrow, when there is no evidence before them that their hopes are something more than a mere speculation. I have seen striking instances of the consciousness of the claims of Christianity felt by men of this class. I have known a man of high position calling his sons around him on his death-bed, and, to their astonishment, begging them to seek Christ before all things, confessing to them that all his life he had been anxious to do so, and handing to them a Bible which he had secretly read and covered with pencil comments. Shortly after, one of those sons was on his own death-bed, and at the last moment repeated his father's request to the survivors. While death was in the house, they all had the strongest inclination to follow the voice that spoke so strongly within; but when the feelings of the moment had become weakened, they had not courage. To this day, these young men delight in composing Christian hymns in English verse.

Seeing that Christianity made little or no progress among Eastern nations after the first century,—indeed, that there has been an actual retrogression in some countries,—there is a disposition in some quarters to fall back on the explanation that Christianity is only one among many forms in which God communicates His Spirit to men's hearts; to accept this fact of the non-reception of Christianity over a great part of the world as a necessity; and therein to find an excuse for ceasing from efforts to follow the command to preach the gospel to all nations, as if that command were limited to the time in which it was spoken, or as if it were a mere rhetorical exaggeration. We are told with much emphasis that "into the heart of the most mistaken worshipers God pours His Spirit, and of His life all His children are sharers; that there is good in all religions, and that religions which we call false may be the best adapted for certain races and countries; that there are heathen nations that have not yet arrived at a state fit for Christianity," &c. These words I take from the *Inquirer*. This sort of language is common among Unitarian writers, and I think it is time to ask, what is meant by it? what are the exact conclusions we are to draw from it? I should be sorry to deny that in all times and among all races, both before and subsequent to the coming of Christ, God had been working upon the hearts of men,—that all the good (and there has been much) in every form of human belief has come from Him. But we cannot overlook the fact that without some departure from the usual working of His Spirit and the direct revelation of Himself through Christ, man was unable to arrive at the full conception of his relation to

God, his duty and his true happiness. Human weakness and sinfulness impeded man in his search after God and truth, and impeded him still more in his attempt to follow the course of action which his own conclusions should lead to. Man required a direct and special communication from his Maker, and it was given; he required commands spoken in no uncertain voice; he required distinct help and encouragement from above,—the most certain assurance that this life was not all,—that soul was a verity, and that immortality was a verity,—that there was a personal God to whom that soul should render itself. God's Spirit is working at all men's hearts, doubtless; but whether it does so with unerring effect, or with faint and varying results, must depend on their being conscious of that influence and knowing from whom it comes. As to the assertion that other religions are better adapted to certain races (an assertion which the *Inquirer* made in reply to a letter of mine on this subject), I cannot admit such a dogma in any sense or in any degree. I should like to know what answer the apostles would have made to such a doctrine. They certainly recognized no such distinction, and had no doubt whatever that the message of Christ was to be delivered to every creature on earth. Let us not then throw upon God the responsibility of the fact that His message has reached so few; let us seek for it in the corrupt forms in which His message was so speedily disguised by human perverseness; let us look to the corrupting influence of human selfishness, lust of power and want of brotherly love, and the influence of the philosophies and idolatries which prevailed in the world when Christ visited it. If Christianity had not been perverted and distorted, neither Mahommedanism or any other teaching could have had power to take its place. All facts bear out this theory as far as my own limited experience goes. Even in the most uneducated Hindoo, occupying the humblest position in the social scale, inheriting the degradation of centuries, I can see the beneficial influence of Christianity. In the educated, high-caste Hindoo, I find a man who by natural disposition is weak, timid and sensitive, tender as a woman in his domestic attachments, shrinking from abuse or suffering of any kind; and when under the influence of Christianity, I find that man making the noblest sacrifices, bearing loss of home and family, abuse and persecution. On the other hand, we have philosophic, enlightened New-Vedantists, not willing to undergo the smallest sacrifices for truth or their country, but outwardly conforming to idolatrous rites which they loathe and despise. Alike in the South-Sea Islander, the Negro of Africa, and the European, there is a capacity for the reception of Christianity, though in ever differing forms.

(To be continued.)

ROSCOE'S POEMS AND ESSAYS.*

THE name of Roscoe, eminent in literature and honoured by all good men for more than two generations, receives from these volumes fresh lustre and the bloom and grace of a finishing touch. Among the men of the last century, the first Roscoe was a remarkable instance of that peculiar culture of mind which, without being merely distinguished by intellectual power or the acquisition of learning, while combining both in a considerable degree as its means and materials, exhibits one of the more perfect types of personal character. The name of William Roscoe, of Liverpool, is also among the foremost in the great social and political movements of his day: and it must be remembered that sixty years ago the labours of the philanthropist involved no little odium and demanded no little courage,—an obstacle and a qualification both now removed from the fashionable pursuit of social science, and left to other and less recognized fields. It has been our privilege to associate freedom of religious thought and the congenial profession of Unitarian Christianity with the elder Roscoe's European celebrity, with the friend of the African and the advocate of national liberty; and it is therefore with no common feelings of respect that we proceed to an examination of this the latest, but sad and brief, record of a now thrice-honoured name.

Happy are we to be able to say in the outset, that we find the rarest mental characteristics and the highest religious principles transmitted unimpaired through three generations of the same family, and displayed successively in its direct lineal representatives. The subject of the memoir now before us inherited no small portion of his grandfather's genius; but he had a more delicate organization; and with less than the ancestral strength or weight of intellect, and much less grain or power of resistance, he possessed perceptive and imaginative faculties of a higher kind; and under a life less fragile or less burdened with trial than that which was his lot, he would in all probability have achieved a high reputation in literature or in public life. But instead of this,—the ambition of devoted friends rather than of himself,—the young Roscoe appears to have left only the materials to build over his tomb the broken column which can but suggest the fair proportions of the perfect shaft. There is therefore a mournful interest in these memorials of a short life of less than six-and-thirty years, and in these literary fragments gathered by the tender tributary care of friendship; and we are invited to examine them in a partial and affectionate mood; though

* Poems and Essays by the late William Caldwell Roscoe. Edited, with a Prefatory Memoir, by his Brother-in-law, Richard Holt Hutton. 2 vols. London. 1860.

when we shall have done so, we are assured that we shall find the claims advanced by their editor more than approved by the critical tests, and shall conclude that it has been right to collect and preserve these records, both for their intrinsic excellence and for the interest which is excited by their author's name.

We speak of the broken column and the unfinished design whenever we contemplate the early termination of a brilliant or promising career. But what, it may be asked, is the standard by which we judge of the completeness of any human career? or, indeed, does any such standard exist? The highest result of human existence which we are capable of apprehending under the limitations of our present life and with the promise of the life to come, is character, or personality; and when high principles and pure and noble thoughts have been wrought into a life and expressed by all its words and deeds, is there not reason to acknowledge a completeness and a success which length of years and uninterrupted labour too often fail to achieve? It is true that life is short and art is long, and that it requires many efforts and many failures before the mind attains a mastery of its materials; but there are also heights of moral elevation and subtle and delicate mental characteristics which will exhibit themselves in those early efforts which the artist is reluctant to permit the world to see or leaves for posthumous admiration. In some rare instances this immaturity of early productions extends only to their form and scarcely impairs their substance. The tone and character especially of literary productions may be high, because abounding in the qualities which we have distinguished, while the imperfections of the form may be due either to the critical fastidiousness or to the constitutional defects of the writer.

These remarks are peculiarly applicable to the contents of the volumes now before us. Diverted by ill health from the profession of the law to the more congenial pursuit of literature, for which he had been prepared by his early tastes and his college studies, their author was not spared long enough to bring more than a divided power to bear on his literary tasks. In consequence of this, these poems especially, and some of the essays, though in a lesser degree, discover a want of finish in their form and style considerably at variance with the vividness and elevation of their thoughts. The poems, however, if we except a very few of them which are obviously literary exercises, though of a most graceful kind, are in their essence anything but juvenile; and for range of thought and depth of feeling they may challenge comparison with the best poetry of the day. Their style, moreover, while it may be called immature in strict regard to artistic perfection of form, is yet *their own*, free from all modern imitation, and possessing a beauty and appropriateness which may be at once distinguished as in the best sense original. Similar remarks may be applied to the essays. With so many models

of excellence among the critical essays which are beyond a doubt the best written compositions in our modern literature, it is scarcely fair to look for an unbroken excellence or brilliance of style; but the positive value of these essays may be asserted with no less assurance than that of the poems, and it is acknowledged that they contributed greatly to the success of the recently-established Review in which they first appeared.

William Caldwell Roscoe was born in Liverpool on the 20th of September, 1823, and was the eldest son of William Stanley Roscoe, himself the eldest son of the historian to whom we have already referred. His mother was one of the daughters of James Caldwell, Esq., of Linley Wood, Staffordshire. He was a student of University College, London, and in 1843 he took his degree in the University of London. He afterwards entered the Middle Temple, and in 1850 he was called to the bar. His practice at the common-law bar, though sufficient to justify his friends in entertaining the hope of his ultimate success, and to give promise of the display of moral and intellectual qualities too rarely associated with the talents of the advocate, was interrupted from the first by periodical attacks of asthma, and was at length abandoned under circumstances which, though certainly indicative of a want of physical power, at the same time discover feelings of honour singularly acute and the highest religious aspirations. Indeed, through the whole of the memoir before us, we perceive the workings of a deeply religious nature; and we are at no loss to reconcile the extract from the diary on the subject of the relinquishment of the bar (p. lxxv) with the fraternal devotion which, in 1852, led Mr. Roscoe to throw up his professional engagements and make a voyage to the West Indies, to join and bring home his widowed brother-in-law, the writer of the prefatory memoir. The loss of his nearest and dearest relatives, and of several friends scarcely less dear, constitutes the personal history of more than ten years of Mr. Roscoe's short career,—the ten years, too, of early manhood, when one fondly looks for the sunshine of life. To one who held the ties of family and of friendship so sacred as did Mr. Roscoe, the series of bereavements recorded in his biography would be events important and of lasting influence. Only a richly-endowed and finely-organized nature could by such events be touched to fine issues and led up to the higher conditions of life. Coarser minds either do not receive, or they can erase and overgrow, the impressions of grief. In the instance before us we have the rich results of an experience rarely vouchsafed, and yet more rarely recorded, to which the biographical memoir affords the clue, and the best of the minor poems give expression. In 1855, Mr. Roscoe married Miss Emily Malin, of Derby; and from this date up to that of his death we have the happiest years of his mature life, spent in full enjoyment of the endearments of home

in more than one delightful residence amid the mountains of Wales. It was during this period that Mr. Roscoe was partially engaged as a partner with a brother-in-law in some granite quarries, and that he produced the best of his literary essays for the National Review. This happy period terminated in 1859. On the 30th of July in that year, he died of fever at the house of his friend, T. Smith Osler, Esq., at Richmond, whither he had retired from the assizes at Winchester, where he had accompanied Mr. Justice Crompton as his Marshal on the Western circuit. To this brief narrative, which tells so much of the sadder events and realities of life, it is only right to add some brighter touches in order more fairly to delineate Mr. Roscoe's character. He was full of fine humour and the most delicate fancy. His thoughts were singularly just and felicitous. His presence carried a charm which it is useless to attempt to describe; but many are the social circles in which the remembrance of it is cherished. He awakened in his most intimate friends an affection which it is impossible to describe. These are the friends who feel how their lives have been enriched by his life; and one of their number has prepared the memoir before us. In his early college days, Mr. Roscoe was remarkable for active and daring feats of personal skill. His figure was slight and gave little indication of strength, but he inured himself to exercises of courage and adroitness of which Mr. Hutton gives us many pleasant instances. His prevailing mood appeared reserved and reflective, and even gave the idea of melancholy. His voice was clear and sweet, never raised to a high pitch and never sudden or rapid. He opened quietly into conversation, but soon displayed a clearness of thought and a surprising fertility of fancy, which seemed to enliven the circle without any particular vivacity of manner on his side, although drawing forth the utmost efforts and eliciting the gaiety of his companions. No man ever was less engrossing in conversation, and few have been so entertaining. The letters which Mr. Hutton has sparingly introduced into his memoir, afford glimpses of the play of Mr. Roscoe's lighter moods; and the extracts are at least sufficient to shew that his wit was of that highest kind which flashes only from profound and affectionate natures. The love of children and tenderness to animals are but other phases of the same affectionate disposition; and these we find described with much delicacy in the words of the biographer and in extracts from Mr. Roscoe's own writings. He united in a singular degree calm views of politics with an almost passionate interest in them; but his interest was not in the politics themselves as subjects of discussion or as means of power, but in national rights and personal liberties. His religious life also seems to have been aloof from controversy, while, as we have already intimated, the religious element was deeply based in his nature. These two character-

istics may be taken together, for they point to the same sources of strength in his character. Never to have been an anarchist or a radical, and never to have dwelt in the regions of scepticism or to have felt the impatience of a controversial spirit, seem to imply an immunity from the dangers of youth. That Mr. Roscoe should have escaped these so lightly, or have outgrown them so early as to exhibit no traces of them in his thoughts or writings, is a circumstance worthy to be noted. It seems to accord with that judicial characteristic which Mr. Hutton describes as so early and permanent an element in Mr. Roscoe's mind; and it is not difficult for those who knew Mr. Roscoe to accept the delineation as correct and even consistent.

We must permit ourselves an extract from the biographical memoir, and will choose a passage from a letter of Mr. Roscoe's on the subject of the hopeful side of religious faith. The sentiments conveyed in it have a remarkable value as coming from one whose temperament was not naturally sanguine, and who had unusual experience of the sorrows of life.

"I think there is such a thing as a man having more vivid faith in sin than he has in God; and that is a grievous evil, and earnestly to be avoided. I think that by constantly aiming at realizing the awfulness of sin, he may lose sight of the benignity and long-suffering of God, as a man long in the dark is dazzled by the daylight. Of these two ways in which God draws us to Himself, by horror of all that is opposite, and by our divine affections, the latter seems to me so much the higher, that I think we should turn our faces to the light even when they are bowed to the dust, and not gaze backwards into gloom from which we seek to fly."

As Mr. Roscoe's political wisdom was not based either in subservience to his own party nor in blind conservatism, so neither were his religious principles grounded in indifference or in acquiescence. A thoughtful man could not range through so wide a scale of religious aspiration and experience without having very distinct ideas in doctrine also. Mr. Roscoe was a Unitarian all the more because he possessed the larger amount of religious insight and had felt the depths of religious emotion. We gather from the admirable letter of his friend, the Rev. J. Hamilton Thom, which is appended to the biographical memoir, how strong an impression the writer of that letter had taken of Mr. Roscoe's religious principles. That the dogmatic element was not prominent in his conversation or in his writings, is but another result of what we have already stated; and to this it must be added that Mr. Roscoe's was a mind of that well-balanced order which is at once conscious of the slow and difficult steps by which scientific knowledge is attained, and trustful of the conscientious labours of other men. Minds like his appear also to possess in themselves a touchstone of truth, and give the idea of a faculty *which* we call intuition because its processes are too subtle for

our analysis. We may here call particular attention to Mr. Thom's letter, and also to that of Mr. Bagehot. The former has a biographical interest extending over the early scenes and circumstances of Mr. Roscoe's life; and both letters add to our means of estimating his character. A man who held so high a place in the esteem of friends possessing in themselves remarkable and peculiar mental powers and the highest moral qualities, would exhibit the riches of his mind and heart variously to each; and from them we gladly gather up the scattered lights and try to form again the image of their friend. A proper biography would of course dispense with these side-lights, or fuse them into its single picture. Wisely, however, has Mr. Hutton chosen to give us his own friendly and affectionate memoir, and to add these memorial letters to his work. He is singularly qualified for the task which he has undertaken, and he has well discharged it. We do not pretend to offer him our praises for his labour of love. He does not require them. But we may say that what he has told us enables us to perceive the nature of that influence and power in his friend's life and character which, more than poem or essay, or aught that can be assessed by any standard of critical value, is, to use Mr. Hutton's own words, "in the highest sense and in the sight of God his most characteristic and noblest work."

We will close our remarks on the prefatory memoir with a passage which is a just summary of character and an epitaph every way worthy to be transcribed.

"I never knew any other man whose death could have made so deep a rent in the hearts and lives of other men outside the circle of his own family. His rich humour, his singular harmony of character, his social ease and insight, the ideal depth and patient meditativeness of his judgment, his public spirit and manly political interests, the sincerity and trustfulness of his friendship, the refined and human character of his tastes, the perfect veracity and light fresh beauty of his imagination, and the true humility of his faith, had made him an object of hope as well as love to many of his companions. There were several I believe who would have been really more elated by his success than by their own; who, had he gained a poet's fame, would have felt their own life brighter; and who have lost in him one of the main vital springs of their own happiness."

Of Mr. Roscoe's poems generally we have already remarked that unmistakeable indications of originality are to be found in their style. This is no slight evidence of something still higher. But though we consider the style and diction of the best of these collected poems as imperfect, they unquestionably have a tone and sweetness peculiarly their own, and which we think would have ripened or might have been cultivated into poetry of a very high order. We distinguish between such of the poems as give this promise, and such as, being for the most part earlier in date,

are of a tentative or imitative kind. We remember, too, that, of all the minor poems, scarcely one was written or preserved by their author with a view to publication. Of the two dramas, Eliduke is the inferior, and is for the most part purely an Elizabethan study. It has much sweetness of language, and shews ability in the construction and movement of its plot. It is pleasant reading, and carries us along with interest throughout; but it has a title only to posthumous publication, and was never designed for the press by its author. Many of Mr. Roscoe's friends will, however, be grateful to the editor for including the tragedy of Eliduke in these volumes, and it is likely to be more attractive to many readers than the work of a much higher value of which we have now to speak.

"Violenzia," on the other hand, is a drama which stands alone in our literature as an attempt to delineate the highest phase of religious life in action on the stage of human events. One painful incident in the story lurks in the title of the drama, and thus suggests a prominence in the plot which it does not really hold. Had the play been called "Ethel," after its hero, it would have been taken up with less reluctance, and the true relation which the incident in question bears to the whole plot, as one only of Ethel's great trials and afflictions, would have been permitted without any tenable objection. The tragedy of Violenzia is an exhibition of magnanimity and public virtue exercised under the sharpest trials and provocations. The story is not taken from history, but contrived for the purposes of the drama. The fortunes of a kingdom are perilled by the vices of a king, whose military chief is the hero, Ethel. The possession of the military power of the kingdom is in Ethel's hands after the conquest by him of a powerful neighbouring state, and at a time when the indignation of both soldiers and people is ripe for revolt, and also when Ethel has the cruellest wrongs of his own to revenge upon the king. Through these temptations Ethel pursues his way in the path of political integrity, diverted therefrom neither by his own wrongs nor by the lives of his dearest friends, though forfeited to the justice which he himself administers. Burdened with this extraordinary charge, he performs his high functions in a spirit of self-sacrifice, though forsaken by all human aid and sympathy, and supported only by his deep religious trust. Ethel's character is the patriotic ideal maintained amid sorrow and desertion. The career of Washington, the historical vindication of the character of Cromwell, and the embodiment of the idea of political duty in Wellington, are the historical sources from which it is conceivable that this character might be drawn. Had the scene and personages of this play been selected from an historical period, like that, for instance, of Kingsley's Elizabeth of Hungary in the Saint's Tragedy, it must certainly have drawn a larger share of attention. But the time and place, the persons and cir-

cumstances, in and among which the action of Ethel is worked out, are imaginary and, as it were, abstract; and the reader has to reconstruct all these for himself before he can realize the grand central figure, with its deep affections, noble aims and heart-breaking sorrows. Few readers will take the trouble to do this; and the only success possible to Violenzia is the silent admiration and wonder of the few poetical minds to whom political virtue and divine trust are realities of human hearts and human history. We would remark particularly the religious element in the hero of this play, both because of its affinity with the mind of the author, and because it exhibits that element free from all known or received forms of religious expression or doctrine. The latter characteristic, like the ideal scenery of the play, tends probably to impair its immediate interest. Many would read of the Puritanism of Cromwell, the Calvinism of William of Orange, the asceticism of Elizabeth of Hungary, or even the fanaticism of John of Leyden; but the calm depths of a divine confidence and the consolations of Christian submission, however fierce the fires or acute the sorrows by which these are tried, need more colour from known events, or more defined form from conventional circumstances, to gain the applause of many readers. That a work of art should fail to gain attention is doubtless a ground for presuming some essential defect; but attention is not always to be gained at once, and for a great work it is but fair to demand room and time for its display. We ask consideration for this drama of Violenzia, because we believe it has qualities which will in due course assert and establish themselves. It has to make its own appeal and to give its own point of view; and we think it contains a body of imagination enough to supply its own colour and exhibit its own form. Extracts from scenes we do not propose to give, because we would treat the tragedy as a whole work of art. The central figure of Ethel must, we admit, bear the whole responsibility of the piece, for the accessories have even perhaps less local colouring or individual interest; though it is no small praise to say that the accessories are equally subordinate and subservient to the central figure. Next to the artistic construction of the plot and the mode of developing the character of the hero through the consecutive events of the story, we would especially commend the pathos. It is based on the purest and least selfish of our human affections, and these are made to yield to the stern demands of the drama; but in yielding, they achieve such triumphs of self-sacrifice as are drawn forth by the spirit of true Christianity. Ethel's visit to the brothers in prison, we may instance as a scene in which the tenderest human affection is asserted in the very act of sacrificing its own objects at the bidding of that Power which is at once the source of justice and the vindicator of faithful love. We have dwelt on this drama because it is the only production on which Mr. Roscoe himself sought for

a public verdict, the only poem in these volumes by which we have any right to pronounce on Mr. Roscoe's title to the name of an artist and a poet.

The high qualities of the drama of which we have spoken at some length, give us an undoubted right to regard the minor poems as something more than the felicitous exercises of an accomplished and thoughtful man. We have alluded to the autobiographical interest attached to many of these poems,—a circumstance sufficient at least to awaken curiosity; but having established the author's claim through his larger work to the imaginative grasp and insight of a poet, we may fairly maintain that the charms which these minor poems have for us rest upon their substantial qualities, and not merely upon our feelings of partiality. Nor should the personal element in many of the finest of these poems lead us to undervalue their intrinsic poetical merits. They were written in the rarer moments of life, and under the influence of feelings naturally extrusive of the purpose of publication; and they must necessarily have been kept sacred by the writer himself from all but his most intimate friends and those for whom they were written. Now, however, they are published without violating any private sentiment whatever. They are instinct with the most elevated thoughts; their imagery is clearly conceived and expressed in language pure and harmonious; and they will take a high place among those pieces dear to our hearts when influenced by emotions of affection and aspiration, or when bowed by the tenderer forms of sorrow; and we shall surely see them transplanted into many a poetical anthology of meditative and devotional verse, among the sweet songs and sonnets which Mr. Roscoe himself loved to remember and repeat, and which his friends associate with the tones of his gentle voice. Much of the popular poetry of the present day is exaggerated in sentiment and confused by indistinct imagery and the affectation of philosophical phrases; and not a few writers stretch out their meagre imaginings with imitations of Tennyson's languor or efforts to rival the learning and obscurities of Robert Browning. The poems which Mr. Roscoe has left us—alas! too few—are written in the spirit of a true artist, aware of both the extent and the limits of his own faculty, and too conscientious in the use of language to attempt to employ it for any other purpose than the clear expression of a clearly defined thought. Had Mr. Roscoe been permitted to regain elasticity of spirit with continued health and leisure, we might have hoped for volumes, instead of a few specimens only, of poems to rank on our shelves with the thoughtful verses of Matthew Arnold. In the composition of the sonnet, we conceive that Mr. Roscoe has been especially successful, and we would instance those at pp. 78, 80, 81, 91, 92, 93, 99 and 357 of Vol. I. as not inferior to the best in that kind of verse.

Volume II. comprises a selection of essays, chiefly on literary

subjects, contributed to the *Prospective* and *National Reviews*, and two or three short pieces which appeared originally in the *Inquirer* newspaper. It is from the contents of this volume that we think the best estimate of Mr. Roscoe's powers may be formed. The essays display in a remarkable degree the judicial characteristic described by his biographer. They are written under a sense of the responsibility attaching to the formation and expression of opinions, too often severed from the function of anonymous criticism. A temptation to excite surprise by paradoxes or to attract by novelties of style, always besets the occasional essayist; and in essays written, as were many of these before us, for the earliest numbers of a new periodical, it might have been almost pardonable to ask some latitude for these expedients. No pardon is, however, required on this ground for anything contained in Mr. Roscoe's critical essays. They are conscientiously written throughout. Their style is excellent, and they abound in passages of singular depth and sweetness. In the literary and social opinions of a comparatively young writer, we ought not to expect to find anything like a complete body of criticism; but nevertheless we do find that these essays are capable of distinct and orderly classification, and that they exhibit the application to the several branches of literature on which they treat, of principles of judgment carefully ascertained and well thought out. The professional critic is very apt to extemporize the data of his judgments. He is seldom amenable for all his criticisms at once. He enjoys the privilege, partly through his anonymous character, of laying down particular principles for one occasion and of refusing to follow them on another. The after-collecting of essays is, however, a test of this quality; and it is not the least advantage which we derive from this custom of comparatively recent date, that an assembling of his works for judgment hangs over every critic who hopes for distinction in his art. Moreover, the quarterly essayist of the present day is not only the critic of literature, art and politics; it is expected that he should also be skilled in delineation of character, and have an insight into the minds of men. He is called upon to exercise no little of the prophetic function. We ask, concerning any one who takes upon himself to direct us in the midst of the conflict of opinions and to examine for us the various writers of the day, what secrets of modern thought and tendency does he open for us? Does he perceive the direction in which we have been moved by the poets and teachers of a preceding age, and can he detect what new forces are being developed in the literary activities which now surround us? Does he share in the religious feelings, and does he enter into the theological thoughts of his day? We do not now put these as abstract questions. We put them because they are to a remarkable extent answered in the volumes before us. The series of essays contained therein have been produced under

the conditions which our questions involve; and if we may look, as we ought to be able to look, among our secular literature for the religious aspects of the age in which we live, we know of no other writings of their kind which contain higher religious characteristics than these essays of Mr. Roscoe.

The reviews of the poets are devoted to Tennyson, Matthew Arnold, Mrs. Browning, Rogers, Moore, Gray and Crabbe. In several of them we alight on passages that remind us of the letters of Keats, wherein are occasional remarks on the nature of poetry and the poetic art such as only a poet's experience could supply. They contain also many acute observations which, taken by themselves, may be considered as axioms. For instance,—

"The reputation of a poet is in his own hands; for a man must be judged by the worst he is capable of, as well as by the best."—P. 31.

"An action is not only not the sole, it is not the highest, subject of the poetic art. Man is higher than his actions, and it is in the representation of the whole man that the romantic drama soars far beyond its classical rival. In Sophocles the action is predominant, and the characters are interesting as they elucidate it. In Shakspere the characters are predominant, and the events gain their main interest from the insight which, by their aid, the poet contrives to give us into some human heart."—P. 50.

"True art never fails to bring enjoyment, as good morals never fail to bring happiness: but the artist is going as far wrong as the moralist, if he makes the enjoyment his work is calculated to afford to others the test and object of his labours."—P. 52.

"Freedom is as noble and as essential in art as in life. In neither can we entirely dispense with laws; but the tendency of advancement is to reduce their number, and to generalize their enactments: and that moral nature and that imagination are the highest, which have within themselves the truest instincts of harmony, and follow them with the simplest spontaneity."—P. 62.

"In the highest mode of poetical imagination, the language and the idea are united like body and spirit, and the poet would find it hard to say which suggested the other."—P. 169.

In another place, he remarks,

"How little a man can receive through the senses alone, without the aid of a prepared imagination!"

This is good, too:

"No man can set too high a value on the affections, but too exclusive a one he easily may."

There is a felicity in the choice of illustrations which is a great and frequent charm in these essays. Speaking of Mr. Arnold's attempt to reproduce the Greek drama in the English tongue, Mr. Roscoe says,

"He thinks he can dig up the dusky olive from the plains of Attica, and plant it in our English wheat-fields; that he can take in its fullest development the most purely indigenous and the most intensely and narrowly national literature the world ever saw, and bid it find new

springs of life some two thousand years later in a nation which has already found its expression in a dramatic literature evolved by itself."

Take also a humorous specimen from the very able review of Crabbe, of whom Mr. Roscoe says,

"He is the plainest of all poets, deals the least in ornament. When he gives you a simile,—as he sometimes thinks it his duty to do,—he puts it in perspicuously, adds it ostentatiously, like a Quaker sticking a flower in his button-hole."

In support of the claims we have urged for the religious tone which pervades many of these essays, we recur to the review of Tennyson, where Mr. Roscoe takes occasion to speak of the characteristic thoughts of the age in relation to the unseen world. He has been finely tracing the contrast between Tennyson and Wordsworth, and combating the idea involved in Wordsworth's "Ode on the Intimations of Immortality in Youth," when he proceeds in the following strain:

"There never was a time when the invisible world occupied the thoughts and mingled itself with the daily interests of so large a mass of men as now. When another world was, to living and dead alike, a *future* world, was relegated in universal opinion to a period beyond the undated sleep of the grave, men believed in it with less difficulty, and lived less concerned by it. Now there are a mass of minds who cannot conceive it as merely future; it is another co-existent world, occupied by the same vital interests as our own, and separated from us by a veil at once thin and impenetrable. And with the growing sense of its closeness and its importance have grown the eagerness of our questionings, the impatience of our uncertainties, the bold and face-to-face grappling of our doubts. Every now and then a new medicine is discovered; it is a specific; we indulge the hope that a disease is destroyed; and for a time it seems to work cures proportioned to its reputation. But before long comes a reaction; it is found to fail; it seems to lose its virtue, even to become powerless, and falls into utter disrepute. And so how many books have been written to *prove* that which men most desire to believe, how eagerly have they been welcomed, how wilfully believed! how have thousands rested on them, who never read them, through their faith in those who have been truly convinced by them! Then as the number spreads of those who judge for themselves, there are seen some who find they do not touch their symptoms. The rumour spreads that they are not infallible, and the gloom is proportioned to the over-confident hope. How many hands have been pierced by leaning on Paley's Theology! And it is the same of those who strive to disprove. How many a desperate charge has flattered itself it should cut through to the very standard of faith, and rushed on to be broken like breaking water, yet leaving terrible memorials of its power! Backwards and forwards rolls the tide of battle, and in proportion as the infantry of Trust wins its slow and painful steps forward, the more desperate and overwhelming seem the onslaughts of the enemy."

In the review of M. Arnold there is a passage upon Goethe's philosophy of self-development, which the reviewer discovers many traces of in the English poet:

"Goethe puts quietly on one side that central spirit of the Christian Revelation which makes the dependent affections the highest elements in our nature, and places our noblest attainable life in that service which is perfect freedom."

Works of fiction obtained a large share of Mr. Roscoe's attention, and were criticised by him from a higher point of view than has been usual. Our recent novelists have dealt widely and almost exclusively with the affections and with the domestic and inner life of society, and hence their attraction for one to whom this ground was so sacred. Four of his best essays in this branch of literature have been selected for publication in these volumes. They are reviews of De Foe, Thackeray, the Brontës and Bulwer Lytton; and we have also a most delightful essay on Tales for Children, in which will be recognized the tenderness and playful humour exhibited by Mr. Roscoe in the dearly-loved companionship of children. We borrow from the articles on De Foe and Thackeray two extracts bearing on the "perfect freedom" of the religious life:

"The highest escape from the dominion of self may be said to have been closed to De Foe. It is where the intellect and the will are in constant activity under the control of the personal affections. Some men, and more women, can lose themselves in others. It is a great capacity to have; for in its highest direction and fullest development it is what the truest exponents of the Christian faith have in all times recognized as the fulfilment of the religious life. That is the service which is perfect freedom."

"We should have no quarrel with an artist who should paint the world as it is—aye, and in far truer colours than Mr. Thackeray dares to use; but then he must embrace the true scope of life, he must not ignore those higher connections from which alone it acquires a purpose, and reduce it to a medley fit only to move the laughter of fools and the tears and scorn of the wise. It is not enough to gaze on the varied conditions of man, and say, We accept them, they are manifestations of the divine will. One can almost imagine that the faith of an animal rises to this uninformed acceptance of the conditions of existence. To man it is granted to touch here and there the general clue of the divine purpose, and to hold ever by that thread which belongs to his individual soul; to him is given a modifying will, a power of choice and an active energy; of him that highest of all things has been said, that he may be a fellow-worker with God. Even in the minutiæ of his daily life he may follow that service which is perfect freedom, and only not be a servant because he has the higher, tenderer invitation to be a child."

Our space will not permit us to examine further the series of essays on the novelists, without denying ourselves the greater pleasure of referring to the essays on "Woman" and "Ghosts of the Old and New School." The former of these created a great interest on its first appearance, and it is probably still fresh in the memory of our readers. Its positions did not pass unchallenged, but we think it will be found to have had its weight

in a controversy, not very profitable perhaps for its own sake, though valuable for the practical questions connected with it. That which was irresistible to Mr. Roscoe, the introduction of humour into the subject, had naturally the same effect on his feminine opponents as banter has in conversation, namely, to irritate rather than to convince. But we think, though Mr. Roscoe might be condemned by a special jury summoned by the *Englishwoman's Journal*, he would be acquitted by the universal suffrage of his countrywomen.

The article on "Ghosts" deals with the follies and superstitions of the spiritualists. Nothing can be finer than the manner in which it rebukes the pretensions of the self-deluded seekers of so-called revelations. The foundations of a rational and trustful faith underlie the whole of the argument against them. With a fitting reverence for the sacredness of that invisible sphere into which the credulous votaries of a false philosophy so presumptuously intrude, the writer is sparing and delicate in the use of ridicule; and with almost a tenderness towards those whose opinions he assails, he convicts them of "distrust in the divine arrangements," and drives them from their position by occupying it with higher and worthier ideas. The concluding portion of this essay is admirable beyond our praise. It speaks of the unseen and the future with a depth and solemnity, enhanced for us now by the reflection that before a year since it was written had elapsed, he who traced those words of hope and trust had himself passed through the gates of life, and beheld the things he hoped and waited for.

THE NATIONAL REVIEWER'S CONTROVERSY.

SIR,

BOTH your correspondents and readers must approve your resolution to bring to an end the controversy with the *National Reviewer*, by giving insertion to his last letter, subject only to the insertion of explanatory remarks by other parties concerned. For two or three such I crave your indulgence.

And, first, I am desirous of throwing off the anonymous, as the Reviewer has virtually done so in his *note* on p. 285. Till now I had not felt justified in implying the generally believed authorship of the article; and when I saw how indignantly Professor Tayler disowned a later theological article in the *National Review* which was fastened upon him as if of course, I was very glad that I had treated the Reviewer throughout impersonally.

He now, however, gives me the opportunity of assuring him (if that be thought necessary because it is too often done) that,

in the part I have taken in this controversy, there has been no feeling of personal discourtesy or disrespect to him. How could there have been, had I known the authorship? But I actually doubted it when I wrote my first comments in your October No.; and my ascription of the article to a semi-orthodox pen (which seems to have annoyed Mr. Tayler—see p. 226, April) was simply caused by the anonymous Reviewer's declaration that "Paul believed in Christ as a *divine personage*," &c. If I have felt that the Reviewer's retorts upon me have been somewhat sharp and supercilious, and not always just, I shall not regard them as shewing personal animosity, though the Reviewer has, by correct conjecture, identified me. But indeed it is not my way either to suspect or to disclaim the intention of personal offence in any public argument or controversy. I neither suspect nor disclaim what I never feel.

But I must protest against several of Mr. Tayler's retorts upon my arguments, though I may now do no more than protest.

He represents *me* as holding conclusions which I, with legitimate argument as I thought, represented the Rappists or Mr. Holyoake as likely to derive from his admissions. I complained of this kind of retort upon me in my letter of February (p. 85, note); and I have to protest against it now as repeated in Mr. Tayler's letter of May (p. 282).

Again, I am charged with "arguing against accepting the account of the ascension *literally*" (p. 277), as the Reviewer does with the resurrection. I have used no argument of the kind. I have only asked what, with our knowledge of the solar system, we can take to be the literal meaning of the phrase, "received up into heaven;" and from the vagueness of the scriptural narratives I have reverently concluded that we do not know *what* or *how* it was. But I have not attempted to change the literal into the figurative, nor the bodily into the spiritual. And I have persisted in regarding the resurrection and the ascension as two events, not one.

I am charged with shrouding my own views in a mystery (p. 227); when what I really said was, that the evangelists have left a mystery hanging over the "restored bodily life" of Christ.

I have not talked of a "psychological starting-point" (p. 277) for my own theory (theory indeed I have none); but quoted that expression, in inverted commas, as Ewald's or the Reviewer's, I forget which (October, p. 589).

And one word as to my unlearned quotations from Ignatius's doubtful Epistles. I am not so happy as to possess *Cureton's Corpus Ignatianum* (and, where I live, to see such a work must be to possess it). I quoted from *Hefele's Patrum Apostolicorum Opera, Tubingæ*, 1855. This learned editor notes Cureton's rejection of these Epistles (or part of them), but critically retains *them as genuine* notwithstanding. Perhaps I had better have

kept strictly within the covers of the New Testament; as I have, of course, no pretension to cope with Mr. Tayler in his own special study, nor any wish to incur again his stinging rebuke, "ought to know." But still, his objection to my quotations is simply their superfluity: he "did not want this additional evidence of a notorious fact." Therefore the fact is admitted for which I quoted Ignatius (as I supposed), namely, that "the Docetæ denied *all* the outward realities (of the life of Christ) alike, and the realists asserted the reality of *all* alike." This was my argument, with or without the help of Ignatius, whom I resign to the hands of Cureton and Hefele.

In the note (p. 285) in which Professor Tayler reveals himself and challenges my identity, he asks, in allusion to what I have said of the previous controversy between him and myself and others on this same subject, in our own names, in which he left seven or eight friendly opponents without reply: "What is intended by this insinuation?" I insinuated nothing. I never do. I only recapitulated facts; and those facts certainly helped to blind me to Mr. Tayler's identity with the *National Reviewer*. Of course I could not know that Mr. Tayler had meditated and commenced a reply, and has it still in his desk. But I do sincerely regret, however potent the reasons of College policy may have been which led him to withdraw from that open and amicable controversy, that it should have been left unfinished then, to be renewed now, less pleasantly, under a semi-transparent anonymous.

I do not know that I have anything to retract or modify in what I have written on either occasion, having written in the belief that the plain statement of one's own views is simply the correlative right to that of others to state theirs. No one is to be called dogmatical or charged with self-assumed "infallibility," I should think, for so doing. He might be recreant to his own convictions of truth if he did less.

EDWARD HIGGINSON,
(The "Unitarian Minister" of previous letters on this subject).

Swansea, May 2, 1860.

THE TRUE APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION.

APOSTOLICAL succession, as taught sometimes, means simply this—a succession of miraculous powers flowing in a certain line. The true apostolical succession is, not a succession in a hereditary line, or line marked by visible signs which men can always identify, but a succession emphatically spiritual.—F. W. ROBERTSON.

PETER AND PAUL: THEIR ALLEGED DIFFERENCES OF DOCTRINE.

A WELL-KNOWN passage in Paul's letter to the Galatians contains an allusion to a somewhat sharp personal antagonism as having taken place one day between himself and Peter, as to the conduct to be observed by Christian apostles in dealing with the mutual repulsions of Jews and Gentiles in the church of Christ. (See Gal. ii. 11—13.)

Upon this diversity (whatever it may have been) of opinion or feeling or action respecting the Jewish law, especially as sharpened on that occasion into open rebuke from one of these distinguished apostles to the other, has been founded a criticism more ingenious (we think) than wise, more minute than exact, more pretentious than safe, and more dogmatically confident in its own conjectural conclusions than conjecture and theory in opposition to history have any right to be. It has been inferred that there was a fundamental and irreconcilable difference between what this criticism chooses to call the *Pauline* Christianity and the *Petrine*. Paul is declared to have preached one gospel and Peter another; the one a Gentile and universal Christianity, the other a narrow Jewish gospel. James and John are also supposed to have taken essentially the same view as Peter, in opposition to Paul; while, however, the same ingeniously minute criticism has found still further varieties to which it has given the equally portentous names of *Johannian* and *Jacobian*.

To us all this seems learned trifling, and worse. Pauline, Petrine, Johannian and Jacobian varieties of the gospel just committed by Christ himself to Paul, Peter, John and James! It recalls to mind the conduct of those needless dividers of the church at Corinth whom Paul (the favourite usually of these critics) warmly rebuked for giving apostolic names to imaginary sects: "Every one of you saith, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas (Peter), and I of Christ." Paul would know nothing of Pauline and Petrine and Apollosian distinctions of doctrine, though he did not dissemble the personal difference which he once had with Peter. He knew quite well that their dispute had not had reference to the principles of the gospel, but only to the conduct of his co-apostle, in a certain matter of good taste, good sense and good feeling, rather than of clear obligation, which Paul himself again and again admitted to be matter of difficulty, requiring manly firmness indeed on the one hand, but also justifying the adoption of prudence and conciliation on the other.

The whole difficulty arose out of the essential design of the gospel, which was, to bless Jews and Gentiles with equal religious privileges and hopes. Christianity sprang up in Jewish *soil, but* with a design as wide as the world. And, in point of

fact, it has blest the Gentile world with the religious light of Judaism and its own superadded, while it has been rejected by the Jews in general for teaching more than Moses had taught, and for teaching others besides those who would consent to learn from Moses first.

The first controversy on record in the Christian church was, as we all know, whether the Gentiles might be admitted into it without being proselyted to Judaism. The zealous Jews determinedly said, No. Many rejected the gospel because they saw how it overleaped their exclusiveness; others, who accepted the gospel, regarded the law as not the less obligatory upon themselves, and wished to impose it upon the Gentiles also on their becoming Christians.

Now these two questions were perfectly distinct, namely (1), whether a Jew on becoming Christian should give up all his Jewish observances; and (2), whether a Gentile on becoming Christian should adopt them. As to the first, it seems to have been left altogether as a matter of feeling for each convert to decide for himself. There is no formal decision or doctrinal assertion on the subject to be found in the recorded words of Christ or any of his apostles. No one said that the Jew becoming a Christian was bound to give up his old religious observances so long as the temple stood and the end of the age was not yet come. As little was he bound to continue them if he chose to relinquish them. In point of fact, the apostles themselves continued to observe the Jewish worship and some at least of its voluntary ceremonies,—Paul himself not less than the others. But, as to the second question, whether a Gentile on becoming Christian must go through the gate of Jewish ceremony, the decision of the apostles (not of Paul only, but of the rest) was perfectly clear and unhesitating. On no account whatever should such a burden be laid upon the Gentile convert. Christianity was for Jews and Gentiles *alike and on equal terms:* the law was no longer needed for the former if they chose to accept to the full their Christian freedom; but on no account was it to be imposed upon the latter, to whom Christ with his spiritual religion, not Moses with his ceremonies, was the only Lord and Saviour. There was no disagreement among the apostles on either of these questions. No Jew was compelled to resign the law; no Gentile to adopt it.

But with two such different classes of converts in view, we are not surprised that the ministry of the gospel to the Jews should have been chiefly conducted by one set of men, and that to the Gentiles by another;—that Paul, Barnabas, Luke, Mark, Apollos, Timothy and Titus, should be the names most constantly connected with the ministry of Christ among Gentiles (though not by any means to the neglect of the Jews, in whose synagogues indeed Paul, pre-eminently the "apostle to the Gentiles," in-

variably preached in the first instance, in every heathen city in which there was a synagogue); and that the ministry among the Jews in Judæa should have been carried on chiefly by Peter, James and John, and yet not so as to exclude them from all interest in the conversion of the Gentiles (to whom Peter was on an early occasion expressly sent).

Now this is, according to the history in the book of the Acts and the various allusions in the apostolic Epistles, the whole explanation of those differences (whatever they may be) which modern criticism has swelled into a pedantic exposition of Pauline or Paulinian Christianity, as opposed to the Petrine, the Johannian and the Jacobian.

There is such a thing as being wise above what is written and above what can be known by any other legitimate means. The problem, however, as written in the Christian Scriptures, is well worth studying, with the solution as there given; for it is illustrative of the genius of Christianity, the characters of its first promulgators and the wants of the world.

Let us see, then, how those Scriptures represent the mutual relations of the apostles Paul and Peter. The facts recorded and the thoughts and feelings expressed on various occasions by the agents in those transactions, have always seemed to us mutually illustrative and quite harmonious, and precisely the most natural in the given circumstances. They shew how gradually but progressively the minds of the apostles opened to the idea of a universal gospel.

If we go back to the beginning of the book of Acts, we find the apostles asking their risen Lord: "Wilt thou at this time again restore the kingdom to Israel?" The earthly kingdom of Jewish expectation is plainly in their minds. The next chapters record the preaching of Peter, in conjunction with John, when he proclaims Jesus to be *Lord and Christ by reason of his resurrection* from the dead, and anticipates a blessing *upon all the kindreds of the earth* in that which is sent to the Jews *first*. Presently (in chap. viii.) we have the gospel preached to the *Samaritans* by Philip the deacon; and Peter (with John) is the instrument of recognizing, on the part of the apostles at Jerusalem, this extension of spiritual blessings to those who stood in religious rivalry with the Jews of purer blood.

In chap. ix. we have *Paul's* conversion from a persecuting Pharisee to the destined "apostle of the Gentiles" (such by pre-eminence, but not exclusively). And in chap. x., while Paul is still perhaps in retirement in Arabia, or is preaching gospel equality to Jews and Gentiles in Cilicia and Tarsus (Gal. i. 17 and 21), *Peter* is taught by miraculous vision no longer "to call common or unclean what God hath cleansed;" he receives the Roman centurion Cornelius and his Gentile household and friends to Christian baptism, and is soon called to account by some of

the brethren in Judæa for having "gone in to men uncircumcised and eaten with them." Thereupon he tells the whole story of his vision and journey to Cornelius at Cæsarea, including the manifestation of the Holy Spirit to those Gentiles as his warrant for baptizing them, and elicits the thankful acknowledgment of the Jewish brethren, "Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life."

In the same spirit Barnabas is sent to Antioch (xi. 22) to welcome the accession of disciples there (who were chiefly Gentiles beyond a doubt); and Paul, on Barnabas's request, comes from Tarsus to help him, and they labour together for a year at Antioch with such success as to originate the Christian name and make that city thenceforth the centre of Paul's missionary journeys.

Having arrived thus far in the history, can we fail to observe that the convictions divinely produced upon the minds of Peter and Paul are identical? They are both Jews to begin with; and are both taught (what neither is ready to imagine without special instruction) that the Gentiles are equally the subjects of the gospel dispensation with the Jews. If Paul's mind laid hold of this great truth more fervently than Peter's, and if his opportunities or inclination thenceforth brought him more in contact with Gentiles, and Peter's more with Jews,—here is indeed "a diversity of gifts, but the same spirit; and a difference of administrations, but the same Lord; and a diversity of operations, but the same God working all in all." But surely there is no difference yet to be seen between the "Pauline gospel and the Petrine;" though we plainly see two very different men each embracing the faith of Christ with all his noble faculties.

The next step in the history of the Acts brings us probably to the time alluded to by Paul in his letter to the Galatians. In Acts xv. we read that "certain men which came down from Judæa taught the brethren (at Antioch), and said, Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved." It is plain that, with the growth of the Gentile church, the old exclusiveness which characterized perhaps the chief part of the Jewish converts, and which certainly had its stronghold in Jerusalem and Judæa, had risen into that aggressive activity which is, from this time, seen interfering everywhere with the liberty of the Gentiles. Not content with observing the law (to a certain degree) themselves, these zealots stepped beyond the bounds of their own free action to impugn that of others. The interference at Antioch brought matters to a crisis. The church there determined to send Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem to consult the apostles and elders of that church on this question. The assembly meets accordingly. The Christian Pharisees (we are not surprised to read) were the chief opponents of Gentile liberty in this deliberation. Paul and Barnabas tell the history of their

successes among the Gentiles. Peter speaks powerfully for freedom, recalling the fact that he himself had long since been honoured by being made a missionary to the Gentiles, "whose hearts God had purified by faith, putting no difference between them and the Jews;" and he protests earnestly against the thought of imposing upon them a yoke which even the Jews, he says, found too burdensome to bear. Surely there is no difference on this occasion between the views of Peter and Paul. James, too, as president of the meeting, sums up in the same spirit, and it is resolved to write a letter recommending certain rules of action to the Gentile converts.

And what are these? Apostolical decrees, they are commonly called; but they are apostolical counsels and recommendations rather, for the guidance of the Gentile Christians at Antioch, and in Syria and Cilicia. The apostles, in their letter to Antioch, say nothing about the law being incumbent even upon Jewish Christians. But they distinctly say, they had never given commandment or countenance to those who insist upon the Gentiles keeping the law. And they express their earnest wish "to lay upon them no greater burden than these necessary things" (prohibitions, manifestly, of things the most directly connected with heathen idolatry and immorality, and most offensive to the moral and religious feelings of every devout Jew),—namely, to abstain from participation in idolatrous sacrifices and festivals, and from the licentiousness which (as is notorious to every reader of classical literature) was the usual accompaniment of idol rites in the very temples where they were celebrated; and also to abstain from "things strangled and from blood," which were strictly forbidden as food by the Jewish law (Acts xv. 20, 29).

It seems to be to this occasion that St. Paul most probably alludes in his letter to the Galatians, as having happened fourteen years after his conversion, when he went up to Jerusalem with Barnabas and took Titus also, whose liberty as a Gentile convert he firmly maintained against the "false brethren." Paley, indeed *(Hor. Paul.)*, seems inclined to refer Paul's rebuke of Peter to an earlier meeting at Antioch; and Wieseler assigns it (as well as the visit to Jerusalem mentioned in Gal. ii. 1) to the journey so briefly summarized in Acts xviii. 22. The chronology of this event is unimportant to our present inquiry respecting Paul and Peter.* But what Paul says in his Galatian letter seems quite accordant with what we read, in Acts xv., of the apostolic council and decrees. He says: "When James, Cephas and John (who seemed to be pillars of the church) perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship, that we should go unto the heathen

* That Paul and Barnabas agreed to separate (Acts xv. 39) after some dispute about Mark, might very well follow the occasion on which "Barnabas (Gal. ii. 13) was carried away with the dissimulation" of Peter and others.

and they unto the circumcision; only insisting that we should remember the poor Christians at Jerusalem, the same which I also was forward to do" (Galat. ii. 9, 10).

It is with some surprise that we learn, after this clear and satisfactory understanding on all hands, that Peter should, on some subsequent occasion,* as we are apt to conclude, have so far forgotten himself as to incur open remonstrance from Paul for timid compliance with the Judaizing party at Antioch. When or how it was, we know not; all that we know is from this allusion in Paul's letter. He says plainly that when certain Judaizing Christians from Jerusalem came to Antioch, Peter withdrew from his previous habits of social intimacy with the Gentiles, and so drew forth this plain-spoken remonstrance from Paul in public: "If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of the Gentiles and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?" (Gal. ii. 14). Was this timidity on the part of Peter? or one-sided amiableness? or an unworthy attempt at compromise? Who knows? But we can no more argue hence that the gospel which he preached to the Jews was different from Paul's to the Gentiles, than we should argue from his denial of his Lord one unguarded moment, that he did not really love him and believe in him. Say that Peter's impulsiveness led him wrong again. Say that his compliance in this case was wrong. Agree with Paul that it was wrong. But, according to the avowal and practice of Paul himself, something was due to mutual conciliation from Gentile to Jew, as well as from Jew to Gentile. Paul himself avows that he became to the Jews as a Jew that he might gain the Jews; and to those without the law as one without the law, to gain them that are without the law; to the weak as weak, to gain the weak; *all things to all men* (under the guidance, that is, of benevolence, and within the limits of sincerity), that he might by all means save some (1 Cor. ix. 20—22). If Peter transgressed these limits one day, none would feel more ingenuous shame for it than he. Specific instances are also on record of Paul's own compliance with the principle which he avowed and which Peter once overdid. Paul, who resisted the zealots on behalf of the Gentile Titus, complied with their wishes in the case of Timothy, whose parentage was half Jewish and half Gentile (Acts xvi. 3). And when Jewish jealousy was stirred against him, during his last visit to Jerusalem, by the false report that he was teaching the Jews to forsake the law, he payed the charges for the offerings of four poor Jews who were completing (apparently) the Nazirite's vow, in order to shew that he himself "walked orderly and kept the law" (Acts xxi. 24). And that he did so keep the

* Paley supposes it a previous occasion, and that Paul's rebuke at Antioch may have confirmed Peter's good principle at the Jerusalem council.

law in his own person, is incidentally proved when he shaves his head at Cenchrea as the completion apparently of a similar vow (Acts xviii. 18); that vow not Apollos's, but Paul's, according to the obvious meaning. We might add that Paul's advice to the Corinthians respecting meats offered to idols, is in strict harmony with the "apostolic decrees," when he earnestly dissuades those who think they "have knowledge" from "sitting at meat in the idol's temple," but would have them freely eat whatever is sold in the shambles, without asking curious questions as to how and where it was killed; and yet, if a weak brother at a feast says, "This has been offered to an idol," would have the strong brother respect the other's scruples. "Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the church of God," are Paul's own words (marking alike his aim and Peter's); "even as I please all men in all things, not seeking mine own profit, but the profit of many, that they may be saved" (1 Cor. viii. and x.).

Such, now, are the outline facts of the apostolical history, as read in the book of the Acts and supplemented by epistolary allusions. We look in vain, we confess, for the alleged discrepancy between the doctrine of Paul and that of Peter. There is difference enough, indeed, between the *Judaizing Christianity* which would retain the law and enforce it even upon the Gentiles, and the *Christianity of Christ, of Paul and Peter and all the other apostles*, which welcomes the Gentiles as purified by faith and permitted freely to enrol themselves as children of God. But Paul and Peter are on the same side in this contrast; it requires the most microscopical ingenuity to set them in opposition.

The minute and shadowy, yet daring, criticism which, on these feeble grounds, finds Paul and Peter preaching different gospels, has also endeavoured to shake the credit of the *Acts of the Apostles* as a history of the first planting of Christianity. In utter disregard to the earliest and most uniform testimony respecting the authorship of that book, which ascribes it to the evangelist Luke, the author of the third Gospel and the companion of Paul in some of his travels, the ubiquitous criticism of the Tubingen school assures us that Luke was not the author, and that Eusebius was mistaken about the universal reception of the book; and that its purpose plainly is (what was never discovered till now), not to write a history of any of the real acts of any of the apostles, but to draw an elaborate and highly-coloured picture of union and harmony as characterizing the early Christian church, such as did not and could not actually exist, and more particularly to reconcile the doctrines of Paul with those of Peter and the rest.

It is a strange theory, somewhat slippery to take hold of, and not quite self-consistent. For it is chiefly from this very

history, thus discredited, that the critics derive their knowledge of Peter's doctrines; and in this very picture, which they say was intended in defiance of fact to reconcile Paul and Peter's doings and sayings, they find the discrepancies which they represent as irreconcilable. Nor do they explain how it is that a writer who, with Paul's Epistles in his hand, was painting an imaginary history of the Acts to correspond, should have left such strange gaps in that history, to be supplied, if supplied at all, chiefly by Paul's letters, yet most perplexing to the harmonist, as Paley has shewn in his minute comparison, and only to be harmonized on the supposition of their being perfectly independent works, neither the history nor the letters having been seen by the writer of the other. How strange, for instance, that the picture-writer of the book of Acts should have left us uncertain whether Paul's contention with Peter was after his second, or third, or fourth, known apostolic visit to Jerusalem! How strange, too, that if he viewed that contention in the Tubingen light, he should have attempted or wished to harmonize the Paulinian and Petreian Gospels!

These wild speculations on the non-historical character of the book of the Acts were published at Stutgard about fifteen years ago, by Dr. F. C. Bauer, and have lately been presented to English readers in the *National Review*.

We presume to think that the reproduction in England of criticisms so rashly speculative and thoroughly destructive, is a thing to be lamented. In Germany, their native soil, they are regarded chiefly as feats of critical skill and ingenuity, which, if they convince their authors for a while (not uniformly the case perhaps), do not necessarily obtain wide credit, or even attention, beyond. Ancient literature, sacred and profane alike, is ransacked for *subjects* on which that nation of scholars may practise their critical dissecting-knives; and ingenuity of critical argument and theory is valued above all literary or theological results. But in England the case is different. Religious belief is far more real and firm, whether it be the belief of prejudice or that of intelligent conviction; and unbelief is more decided and thorough too. These speculations are therefore likely, if they gain any attention among us, to pass for more than even their authors think them worth. We are not a nation of students and critics. The small amount of real study that is devoted among us to theological subjects, had need be employed first in thoroughly mastering the *contents of the Scriptures* themselves. How many readers of our secular periodical literature have done this, so as to be able to compare intelligently the various co-related portions of the Christian Scriptures, not to mention the Jewish as related to the Christian? When this degree of biblical knowledge shall have become current among us, it will be time enough to test the worth of subtle critical arguments offered in disproof of the his-

torically-attested authorship and age of the books of Scripture. But without such a theologically-prepared public, such contributions to public literature are calculated, we fear, to minister rather to indifference towards the Bible, if not to an empty and conceited scepticism, than to sound scholarship or true philosophy. Yet if their readers are in any instance led to study the Christian records more carefully and thoroughly, such study, we feel well assured, whatever its ultimate result, must be good, both mentally and morally, in proportion as it is intelligent, thorough and serious.

But, after all, perhaps we have been treating the English review article from a wrong point of view. Some years ago, Archbishop Whately astonished and amused the critical world by the publication of "Historic Doubts respecting Napoleon Bonaparte;" and that clever *jeu d'esprit*, which made it problematical, almost to the point of critical disproof, whether Napoleon the Great ever lived, has occurred continually to our minds in reading the critical arguments adduced against the historical character of the book of the Acts. Has Archbishop Whately been playing pranks upon the *National Review*, and the editor taken in earnest what was meant as a satire upon German ultra criticism? Is it in the spirit of the "Historic Doubts" that the "Acts of the Apostles" are now shewn to be unhistorical, and we are left to infer that the apostles (if there were such persons) did no acts, but only wrote letters? It might be some satisfaction to the political world if our facetious Archbishop, or Reviewer, would take the trouble to *eliminate* Napoleon III. by the same critical process; and other National Reviewers would, no doubt, be glad to have the world rid of that monster, John Bright, and that "great crime," the pending Reform Bill, both of which are perfectly incredible (on critical principles) as existing facts of this second half of the nineteenth century.

COWARDICE OF UNTRUTHFULNESS.

Death is not the worst thing in this life; it is not difficult to die—five minutes and the sharpest agony is past. The worst thing in this life is cowardly untruthfulness. Let men be rough if they will, let them be unpolished, but let Christian men in all they say be sincere. No flattery, no speaking smoothly to a man before his face, while all the time there is a disapproval of his conduct in the heart. The thing we want in Christianity is not politeness, it is sincerity.—F. W. Robertson.

CORRESPONDENCE.

SERVETUS'S "RESTITUTIO CHRISTIANISMI."

Sir,

Every person who is at all acquainted with the history of rare books is aware of the fact that the "Restitutio Christianismi" of M. Servetus is among the greatest of all rarities, only two copies, I believe, of the original edition being known to bibliographers,—the one in the Imperial Library of Paris, the other in that of Vienna. In Mr. Wallace's Antitrinitarian Biography, Vol. I. p. 460, I find the following passage:

"The original MS., written by Servetus's own hand, once belonged to Cœlius Horatius Curio. It afterwards found its way into the library of M. Du Fay, with the rest of whose books it was sold at Paris, in 1725. The purchaser was Count De Hoym, Polish Ambassador at the French Court, who bought it for 176 livres. It was afterwards the property of M. Gaignat, and was sold, with the rest of that gentleman's library, in 1769. What next became of it, and whether it is now in existence, the present writer has not been able to ascertain. It was in a very tattered and mutilated state when in the possession of M. Gaignat."

In the Dictionaire Bibliographique, Historique et Critique, published at Paris, in 1802, by Delalain, I find under the head, "Librorum Serveti de Trinitate divinâ, Codex MS. Autographus," iv. 4, the following note, which shews that the MS. thus mentioned was the one referred to by Mr. Wallace:

"MS. rare et precieux, qui renferme l'original de la plus grande partie des vii livres de Trinitate divinâ de Servet. vendu 176 livres chez M. Du Fay en mar. bl. avec une note manuscrite de la main du feu M. Du Fay, à la tête de volume. Vendu ensuite 116 livres avec le même note chez M. le Comte De Hoym, et enfin 240 livres chez M. le Duc de la Valliere en 1784."

The history of the MS. tallies with that given by Mr. Wallace; the account of the contents, however, differs, as the seven books on the Holy Trinity were printed in 1531 at Hagenau, while the Restitutio Christianismi was printed at Vienne in 1553.

I have found, however, a more complete description of the above MS. in a Catalogue not cited either by Mr. Wallace or Delalain, although the latter mentions that he made use of it in compiling his Dictionary; I mean the "Catalogue des Livres de la Bibliotheque de feu M. le President Bernard De Rieux." Paris, 1747. On page 49, No. 469, is—

"Librorum Serveti de Trinitate divinâ Codex MS. Autographus in 4 mar. bl. in fronte libri apparet nota quæ sequitur, manu D. Du Fay exarata.

"Forsan ipsius auctoris autographus Codex hic MS. qui fuit celebris Bibliopolæ Basiliensis Cœlii Horatii Curionis, videtur prima conceptio (vulgo l'Esquisse en termes de peinture, ou le dessein) Libri valde famigerati Mich. Serveti à Joanne Calvino cum ipso Serveto combusti, cui titulus; Christianismi restitutio, hoc est, totius Ecclesiæ Apostolicæ ad sua limina vocatio, in integrum restituta cognitione Dei, fidei Christi, Justificationis nostræ, regenerationis, Baptismi, et Cœnæ Domini manducationis; restituto denique nobis regno cœlesti, Babylonis impiæ

captivitate soluta, et Antichristo, cum suis, penitus destructo; typis mandati anno 1554* Viennæ Allobrogum (Balthaz. Arnollet) in 8, pag. 734, cujus exemplar unicum, quod in Bibliotheca Principis Hassiæ, quæ est Casselis, asservabatur, quærenti et perscrutanti curioso admodum Principi Eugenio à Sabandia, cum ab aliquot annis pertransiret Casselas, patere non potuit, ipso Landgravio comite et inquirente adeo ut de jactura illius Libri unici nullus fit dubitandi locus."

The MS., Servetus' seven books on the Trinity (1531), his Dialogues on the Trinity, in 2 books, 4 chapters on the Justice of the Reign of Christ, published at Hagenau in 1532, together with an Apology for Servetus, by M. Postell, a MS. work, sold at De Rieux' sale for 799 livres.

From the above note we must conclude that the autograph was neither the original MS. of the seven books on the Trinity, nor that of the Restitutio Christianismi as it afterwards was printed.

Is it not very possible that this MS. may be the document produced by La Fontaine, the nominal accuser of Servetus at the sitting of the Court on the 14th Aug., 1553, of which Servetus is reported to have said, "Qu'il confesse l'avoir ecrit et reconnoit l'écriture mais qu'il n'a pas fait imprimer ni publié le dit livre écrit a la main, mais seulement étoient envoyés à M. Calvin, il-y-a environ 6 ans, pour en avoir son jugement"?—Extract from Arch. Eccl. Bern. vi. p. 261, printed in the Appendix to Trechsel's Michael Servet. und seine Vorgänger, p. 289.

The above notes bring down the history of the MS. fifteen years later than Mr. Wallace, and give an intermediate stage in its history. Can any of your readers trace it further, or say whether it be still in existence?

Further, is anything known of the President De Rieux, whose Catalogue contains the text of the valuable note of M. Du Fay? I can find no mention of him in Moreri, in Rose, Gorton, Knight or Griffin's Dictionaries; and the only bibliographical collection among those which I have been able to consult that takes notice of the collection of De Rieux, is Delalain's Dictionaire Bibliographique, which names it without remark.

It would be also interesting to know whether the Apology of Postell was ever printed. Brunet in his Manual does not mention any such work, and although De Rieux had six works by him, a printed edition of the MS. is not among them. Neither Mr. Wallace nor Trechsel mentions the name of Postell.† I annex the full title of the Apology:

"470. Apologia pro Serveto de anima mundi, sive de ea natura quæ omnino necessaria est, et habenda est media, inter æternam immobilemque, et creatam mobilemque, estque consubstantialiter in ipso Christo sicuti est, etiam habenda, contra aspergines et præcipitatum Calvini in hanc causam judicium: autore Guill. Postello restitutionis omnium primogenito hac in causa maligne perstricto. MS. in 8, bound in red mor."

S. Alfred Steinthal.

Liverpool, April 21, 1860.

* This is an evident mistake for 1553.

† Dr. Jortin, in the preface to his Remarks on Ecclesiastical History (Works, ed. 1805, I. p. 175), quotes the sentence of the Venice Inquisition on Postell: "Postellum non esse hæreticum sed tantum amentem."

ON THE EVIDENCE OF THE GENUINENESS OF THE HISTORICAL BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

THERE are certain principles of reasoning upon this subject which, as it seems to me, have not been sufficiently attended to by the writers on either side of the question, and a want of attention to which has occasioned misconception of the true nature and force of the evidence. Many seem to imagine that the writers who mention or quote from these records, prove nothing more than that the Gospels and Acts existed at the time when they themselves lived. This idea has led the defenders of the genuineness of these books to be anxious to find references to them in the very earliest Christian writers, and to be eager to represent very doubtful resemblances of expression as quotations. This excessive and unnecessary desire to find quotations from the Gospels, is, I think, observable in the earlier part even of Dr. Lardner's very valuable work. This has led those who perceived the insufficiency of such supposed quotations to imagine that there was no proof that the Gospels were written much earlier than the time of the first Christian writers, who expressly mention them by name, and attribute them to the authors to whom they are generally ascribed. But a little consideration will, I think, shew that this is quite an erroneous supposition. For when a writer, who lived in Gaul or Rome or Africa in the second century, expressly mentions the Gospels, and states as an undoubted fact that they were written by the authors to whom they are now attributed, he proves not only that they existed at the time when he wrote, but that they were then universally received among Christians as genuine,—that a sufficient time had elapsed since they were written for them to be widely diffused through the whole Roman empire, which, as there was then no printing and no such means of diffusing books as now exist, must have taken a long period of time,—and that through all this time their genuineness had never been questioned, but that they had been always regarded as the writings of the persons whose names they now bear. Now this, as it seems to me, must be regarded as conclusive evidence of the genuineness of these books, unless some clear proof be given that they were not written till after the time when the persons to whom they are usually attributed lived. And if we examine and compare the Gospels, we shall, I think, find some remarkable internal indications of their genuineness and authenticity. Thus, if we compare Matthew xv. 9, with Mark vii. 13, we shall observe that Matthew relates the objection of the Pharisees that the disciples of Jesus transgressed the tradition of the elders, without any explanation, as was perfectly natural in a person writing in Judæa, where all persons knew what that tradition was; but that Mark thought it necessary to explain what that tradition was, which agrees with the opinion of the early Christian writers that Mark wrote his Gospel in some Gentile city. That the writers of the first three Gospels derived their accounts partly from certain memoranda of the discourses of Jesus is, I think, evident from their frequent verbal agreement. With respect to Luke, he expressly tells us, i. 2, that he was not an eye-witness of the life of Jesus, but wrote entirely from the information of others; and from the use of the pronouns *they* and *we* in the book of Acts (xvi. 9, 10; xvii. 1; xx. 5, to the end of the book), I think it is evident what parts of that book were written from

his own personal knowledge, and what parts were written from the information of others, which very possibly in some minute particulars he may not have correctly understood. The Gospel of John bears the most clear marks of having been written by some person himself well acquainted with Judæa, with Jewish customs, and with the Hebrew language, but writing in some Gentile city, and conscious that his readers would need to have all references of this sort to be explained to them. Thus, i. 41, iv. 25, having recorded the mention by Andrew, and the woman of Samaria, of the expectation of the "Messiah," the writer of the book adds an explanation that "Messiah" means the "Christ," or the "anointed of God." Again, vi. 4, he explains that the Passover was a feast of the Jews; v. 2, he particularly describes the Pool of Bethesda, and the belief of the Jews, in which he probably himself shared, respecting it. These and many similar instances, which a careful reader of that Gospel will observe, confirm the general opinion that it was written by the apostle John, at a considerable interval of time after the death of Jesus, and not in Judæa, but at Ephesus. Such appear to me to be the conclusions to which a careful examination of the evidences, both external and internal, respecting the genuineness of the Gospels, will lead an unprejudiced inquirer.

T. C. Holland.

ON THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS.

It seems to me that two opposite mistakes are very prevalent in relation to this event, and that each has had a great tendency to produce the other. Many of the defenders of Christianity seem to imagine that it is necessary for that purpose to maintain the complete freedom of the Gospels from all mistakes in the minutest particular, and the possibility of harmonizing all the statements of the different Gospels with respect to every circumstance, however minute or unimportant. This remnant of the old idea, that the authority of the Scriptures rested on the belief in their verbal and plenary inspiration, has led many, who could not avoid seeing irreconcilable inconsistencies between some of the statements of the various writers of the Gospels, to disbelieve, or at least doubt, even those facts in respect to which those writers all agree. But if, observing that those writers never claim any verbal inspiration, that one of them, Luke i. 2, expressly says that he wrote only from the information of other men, and that the others appear to have written partly from their own recollections and partly from memoranda of the discourses and actions of Jesus, we apply to the examination of their accounts the same principles which guide us in our examination of other histories, we shall, I think, be able to avoid both these mistakes. It is impossible to conceal the fact that there are evident differences in the statements of the different Gospels with respect to some of the circumstances of the manner in which the resurrection of Jesus was first made known to his disciples. All attempts to represent these accounts as perfectly agreeing with one another are evidently fruitless. But no person who has carefully cleared his mind from all idea of the verbal *inspiration* of the Gospels, and has observed the frequent similar instances

which exist in other writers of inconsistencies in the statements even of contemporary historians respecting the particular circumstances of facts, the general truth of which still remains indisputable, will, I think, regard this as any objection to the belief of the resurrection itself. A remarkable instance of this kind of inconsistency between two almost contemporary writers, occurs in the statements of Clarendon and Burnet, in relation to the death of the Marquis of Argyle, in the beginning of the reign of Charles II. One of them, not having the books at hand to consult, I do not remember which, states that the Marquis was beheaded on the Saturday, the other that he was hanged on the Monday. Which of these is the correct statement, I do not think it is now possible to ascertain with certainty, but that does not throw the slightest doubt on the fact that the Marquis was, through the treachery of Monk and the virulence of the Tory party in Scotland, judicially murdered. In the same manner, though I see no possibility of reconciling the statements of the evangelists as to all the particulars of the appearances of Jesus to his disciples after his resurrection, yet that does not lead me in the slightest degree to doubt the facts in respect to which they all agree, that his body was in a miraculous manner removed from the tomb, and that he appeared on various occasions in a bodily form to his disciples. Some misconceptions, as it seems to me, are very prevalent in regard to the conclusions to be drawn from these facts. Many persons appear to suppose that the body of Jesus was restored to a life precisely similar to that of other men, and that therefore he might be seen at any time by any persons with whom he was present. But it appears to me that the accounts of his appearances to his disciples do not at all support this supposition. The removal of the body, and his appearance to his disciples in the same bodily form which he had before his crucifixion, were necessary to establish the miraculous nature of the transaction, and to give them clear evidence of his continued existence; but I think all the circumstances related of his various appearances shew that the mode of his existence was completely changed, that he was visible only at those particular times and to those persons to whom God saw it fitting that he should appear. That the word ὠφθη does not always necessarily imply a *visible* appearance, is, I think, evident from the case of Paul; for there is no statement that Paul actually *saw* Jesus, but only that he *heard* him, and was convinced, both by the sense of hearing and by the attending circumstances, that it was Jesus who spoke to him. These considerations clear away from my mind all doubts respecting the reality of the resurrection of Jesus, and I hope they may have a similar effect on the minds of others.

T. C. Holland.

INTELLIGENCE.

MANCHESTER DISTRICT UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

This Association originated from the movement which took place at the last meeting of the Provincial Assembly. It consists of a union of congregations and ministers in the Manchester district for the purposes of rendering aid where needed to existing churches, and to assist in forming new ones. The Rev. W. Gaskell, M.A., is the President of the Association, and Peter Eckersley, Esq., the Honorary Secretary.

At an early meeting of the General Committee, the Rev. James C. Street was unanimously invited to accept the office of missionary. Mr. Street, having acceded to the invitation, entered upon his duties on the 1st of March, 1860.

In April, the congregations assembling at Swinton and Blackley were received into the Association. A circular addressed to the members of every household in those places was drawn up by Mr. Street, and 2000 copies distributed. At Swinton, the regular services have been vigorously sustained. At Blackley, the chapel has been opened for *evening* services, and a course of lectures expository of Unitarian Christianity delivered. The Revds. T. E. Poynting, G. H. Wells, J. Cropper and J. C. Street, with H. J. Marcus, Ph.D., have taken part in the course. The Rev. J. C. Street delivered the opening lecture to a large and attentive congregation, and during every succeeding Sunday the attendance has steadily increased. Efforts are now being made for the establishment of a Sunday-school. The prospects appear to be very hopeful at Blackley.

A preacher's plan has been agreed upon by the ministers connected with the Association, and four laymen have enrolled themselves in the ranks of preachers. This plan, by promoting a free exchange among the ministers, and by enabling the ministers to give aid at the mission stations, has been already productive of much good, and promises to be a very valuable auxiliary to the Association.

A series of lectures is now in course of delivery at Oldham, the attendance upon which is very satisfactory.

Arrangements have been made for the formation of a congregation at Middleton. The Temperance Hall, which will accommodate upwards of 400 persons, has been engaged. Two thousand five hundred copies of a circular inviting attention to the preaching of Unitarian Christianity has been distributed from house to house, and a course of lectures commenced by the Revds. J. C. Street, G. H. Wells, J. Freestone, S. F. Macdonald and H. J. Marcus, Ph.D. On Sunday evening, May 6th, the opening lecture was delivered by the Rev. J. C. Street, in answer to the question, "What is Unitarianism?" Upwards of 130 persons were present, who appeared deeply interested in the service. Dr. Bateman's Penny Hymn-Book was used on the occasion. There appears reason to hope that a congregation may be established in this place.

The old chapel at Platt, of which the Rev. W. Whitelegge is the minister, is to be opened on May the 20th for *evening* services, when a course of lectures expository of Unitarian Christianity will be commenced by the Rev. J. C. Street. The Revds. J. Freestone, W. Gaskell, T. E. Poynting, E. W. Hopkinson and C. W. Robberds, will continue the course.

Efforts are in progress to obtain a preaching-room at Miles Platting, Manchester, where the nucleus of a congregation already exists.

This is the work already on the hands of the Association; other places are about to be opened, and many more might be undertaken with success if only a larger staff of efficient preachers could be obtained.

Up to the present time, the funds promised to the Association are, in private and congregational subscriptions, £256. 13*s.*, and in donations, £61. This amount will, it is expected, be largely augmented by additional subscriptions and donations, and by the annual collections of the congregations connected with the Association.

The wide and promising field which is already seen is a sufficient proof of the absolute necessity of this and similar Associations, and it is hoped that more labourers will soon be found to take part in gathering in the harvest.

MANCHESTER DOMESTIC MISSION SOCIETY.

The annual meeting connected with this Society was held at the Lower Mosley-Street school-room, on Monday evening, April 30. Upwards of a hundred ladies and gentlemen sat down to tea. After tea, the meeting was adjourned into the upper room, where other friends of the Society were assembled. Among those present were the Revds. Wm. Gaskell, T. E. Poynting, J. Drummond, Jas. C. Street,

R. W. Hopkinson and J. Harrop. There were also present Mrs. Gaskell, Eddowes Bowman, P. Eckersley, J. Ashworth, R. Aspden, S. D. Darbishire, J. Armstrong, B. Heape, R. Shipman, J. Shawcross, &c. &c.

R. Shipman, Esq., was called to the chair. He proceeded at once to call upon the Rev. R. W. Hopkinson to read his report. In simple and touching language Mr. Hopkinson gave a clear and graphic account of the operations of the ministry to the poor at the station situated on Rochdale Road. He detailed several cases which had come under his notice, which shewed the honest independence and Christian heroism of some of those who adorned the lower ranks of life. He also narrated circumstances which proved the necessity for discrimination in almsgiving. The number of visits he had paid to the homes of the poor during the year was about two thousand, and of these the majority were to the sick and the dying. Disease and death, he said, had been very busy during this severe and protracted winter. Mr. Hopkinson then referred to the pernicious vices of intemperance and gambling, which he said were alarmingly prevalent among the operative classes in Manchester, and shewed how he had endeavoured to counteract their influence. He then gave a detailed account of the various agencies employed at the mission station. These were all in a healthy and solid state. There was no great change in the numbers attending public worship, but he had been glad to observe that the congregation was beginning to assume a settled and permanent character. He spoke in high terms of the zealous and efficient men who were gathered about him, and who rendered such important aid in carrying out the various agencies of the Society. He concluded his report, which was characterized by the distinguishing merits of modesty and simplicity, amid the plaudits of the meeting.

The Chairman then called upon Rev. J. Harrop to read his report. Mr. Harrop stated that the mission was an entirely new one, and that it had only been in active operation during the last eight months. He then made a lengthy statement of his reasons for, and aims in, entering upon this ministry to the poor. The body of the report went on to shew that the Tomlinson-Street station, Hulme, was succeeding to an unexpected extent, that the congregation and Sunday-schools were already too large for the limited accommodation provided, that a distinct religious community had been established, and that numerous and important agencies were actively and successfully at work. Mr. Harrop concluded his elaborate report by making a very strong appeal to the promoters of the Society for additional accommodation, and resumed his seat amid the applause of the audience.

In the absence of the Treasurer, Mr. R. D. Darbishire read the cash account, which shewed an enlarged income and expenditure in consequence of the formation of the new station, and drew attention to the following facts,—that upwards of £19 had been contributed by the members of the Rochdale-Road station to the funds of the Society, and that next year increased subscriptions would be required to meet the enlarged expenditure at the Hulme station.

The following ministers and gentlemen then addressed the meeting: the Revds. Wm. Gaskell, T. E. Poynting, J. Drummond; and Messrs. E. Bowman, J. Shawcross, R. Shipman and P. Eckersley.

The entire proceedings were full of interest from the fact that the Society was in a more satisfactory state than during any previous period of its history, and that a new station had been established which appeared to be in a flourishing condition. There was an earnest tone about the meeting which promised even greater things during coming years. The true spirit of Christian zeal is beginning to manifest itself, and both ministers and laity are wakening up to a lively sense of their increasing duties and responsibilities. The only danger seems to be, that a sense of satisfaction may be developed by a few successes, and in consequence diminished exertions made. If this be jealously guarded against, and the vastness of the work be rigidly kept in view, the field of labour will be continually widening, and more sheaves will be gathered for the harvest of the Lord.

BOLTON DISTRICT UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

The usual half-yearly meeting took place at Bury on the 26th ult. A considerable number of members and friends of the Association attended from different parts of the district, especially from Bolton, and ten ministers. The services in the chapel were commenced by Rev. T. E. Poynting, and a seasonable and interesting discourse was addressed to the congregation assembled by Rev. M. C. Frankland, from 1 Thess. v. 21, "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." After dwelling on the scriptural character and reasonableness of Unitarian principles of investigation, and the belief generally prevailing among the body, the preacher's

object was to set forth what he conceived to be the spirit that should animate all our missionary efforts. Believing there are many who have been driven out of other religious societies by the erroneous doctrines which have been added to the simple faith of Christ, and many who have never been connected with any religious society at all, to whom our principles would be acceptable as enabling them to encounter the difficulties and trials of life, the preacher urgently advocated their diffusion on account of their moral and religious influence. Contrasting the views taken of the character of the Supreme Being with those generally held by Unitarians, he reminded those who doubt the propriety of missionary effort of the lively joy in the deliverance so often experienced by those who have been led to renounce the erroneous doctrines in which they had been brought up, and to accept what they now believe to be the truth of the gospel. The motive for missionary effort being benevolent, benevolent should be the manner in which it is carried on. "We carry peace in our right hand," he continued, "truth on our lips, love in our hearts. We say to our brethren, this is our ground; here we find a good foundation; examine it well. Here we find light and truth and peace; search and see; it may be you will find them too. Here we find hope and consolation, and the assurance of a Father's mercy and love; who can tell but that in the providence of God you also may be able to lay hold of these unspeakable blessings? We have this treasure in earthen vessels; we are liable to error in judgment; we may be thinking much of that which is little, and too little of that which is comparatively great; we have this treasure in earthen vessels, but we believe that it is a treasure, and in it we are desirous that others should share."

At the conclusion of the religious service, tea was served in the spacious schoolroom beneath the chapel. The chair was then taken, *pro. tem.*, by Rev. John Wright till the arrival of the Chairman, William Grundy, Esq., of Seedfield, who continued the proceedings. In addition to the sentiments usually given, in reference to the Association and institutions of the district, and civil and religious liberty, the progress and prospects of the East Lancashire Unitarian Mission occupied and interested the meeting. Mr. Wright and Mr. Robinson, the missionary minister, adverted to the state of the rising congregations at Heywood, Accrington, Burnley and Blackburn. With much that was encouraging in their statements, there was no concealment of *the obstacles* which everywhere lie in the way of the propagation of our views of Christ and God. For the removal of these, the most persevering zeal and untiring effort, united to tact and discretion, appeared to be indispensable. The laity in this district shew the deepest interest in the success of this movement, and have supplied with much liberality the funds requisite for the commencement of the work. May their earnest expectations be realized!

The autumn meeting of this Association was announced to be held at Rochdale, the religious services to be conducted by Revds. T. E. Poynting and J. T. Whitehead.

F. B.

RE-OPENING OF THE BATH UNITARIAN CHAPEL.

About two years ago it was found that this chapel had become insecure, in consequence of the construction of a sewer in the adjoining street. Some time was lost in an attempt to obtain compensation from the Town Council. A very small sum—seventy-five pounds—was at length awarded, and the congregation resolved to do all in their power themselves. They consulted as their architect Mr. W. J. Green, himself brought up amongst them, from whom they received a most able report of what it was desirable to do. His plan included rebuilding the north end in the form of an apse, strengthening the foundations by additional masonry, new windows, ceiling, side galleries and entrance. Advantage has been taken of these alterations and additions to give to the building an entirely new character. The style adopted was that used by the early Christians and generally known as Byzantine. On the side of the old vestry an elliptical apse was erected, the entrance from Trim Street being done away with, and a new one, with a spacious vestibule, being made at the other end under the gallery. From this vestibule there are two staircases leading to the galleries, and a small vestry containing the chapel library. The interior has many striking and beautiful features. Most prominent is the apse, which is extremely handsome, with its semi-domed windows of coloured glass, its panels adorned by illuminated texts, its simple pulpit, desk and communion-table, and above all, on the front of the highest arch in gold letters, "Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, and goodwill to men." Around the walls above the galleries, and supporting the groined ceiling, are rows of pillars of Portland stone, enamelled by Magnus, of London, in imitation of Aberdeen granite; while below the galleries are pillars of Bath stone for the inner supports,

and of light cast-iron for the outer ones. The carving of the capitals of the stone pillars has been much admired, nearly all having different flowers and foliage. Instead of the old, high, uncomfortable pews, the congregation have adopted open benches, with carved ends and sloping backs. This wood-work is all of dark oak, contrasting well with the rich colours in the windows and the upper parts of the building. In the south gallery is a new organ, built by Mr. Clark, of Bath, the tones of which are considered very good, and the front harmonizes with the ornamental work of the chapel.

The entire expenses, including the hire of a temporary place of worship for ten months, will amount to nearly £1700. The congregation have themselves subscribed £1150, and they have received £300 from friends at a distance; so that they require £350 to avoid a debt. In their appeal for further aid, they mention that Bath has been always a place of resort for Unitarians from various parts of the kingdom, to whom it is hoped the improved chapel will be an object of interest.

The services in celebration of the re-opening were held on Thursday, May 10. At a previous meeting the congregation had resolved to use Mr. Piper's Liturgy for six months, in order to ascertain whether it would be generally liked. On this occasion, the Rev. W. J. Odgers, minister of the chapel, offered a dedicatory prayer; the Rev. W. James, of Bristol, read the liturgy; and the Rev. W. Gaskell, of Manchester, preached from the words, "Contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." It would be difficult to do justice to the impressiveness and appropriateness of this sermon. The audience was large and most fully sympathised with all the preacher said, especially with his introductory remarks on the manifestations of beauty in the outward universe, and the duty of bearing them in mind in rearing temples for the worship of God. The collection at the close of the service amounted to £40. 12*s*.

In the evening, about 200 members of the congregation met at the Assembly-rooms, Jerom Murch, Esq., in the chair. Friends were also present from London, Bristol, Bridport, Newbury, Warminster and other places. The intercourse thus afforded was one of the most pleasant and useful features of the celebration. Bound by one common bond of attachment to their faith and zeal for its advancement, the meeting experienced no common pleasure.

Mr. Murch on taking the chair said, that the honour and pleasure of presiding over the meeting belonged to the minister of the congregation rather than to himself, and he wished he could have persuaded his friend Mr. Odgers to occupy the post. One advantage, however, of the present arrangement was that it brought him again face to face with many kind and valued friends; it enabled him to offer his greetings to those, unfortunately now only a small number, with whom he once had most pleasant as well as sacred relations, and it gave him an opportunity of welcoming members of other communions whose name and whose faith were different from their own. He did this heartily, because every year's experience convinced him that, necessary as it was for Unitarians to maintain a separate position, yet some of their greatest objects could be best accomplished by meeting on any high ground, civic, scientific, political or charitable, those who differed from them in theology, and by learning from them much that they were qualified to teach. We are met this evening (said Mr. Murch) under peculiar circumstances. We have accomplished an object which was to us very important: the renovation and re-construction of our house of prayer. We have thought it right to confine ourselves to no stinted, grudging outlay, but to give the first-fruits of our substance in order that the taste and beauty which we admire in other buildings may be to some degree manifest there. On this point, we concur sincerely with our excellent preacher in the morning; and while we would avoid all inconsistent decoration, we would shew that places dedicated to Him who had made everything beautiful in His time were worthy of no trifling effort. It seems, my friends, to have been destined that our pleasure this day should not be without alloy. The Egyptians, we are told, were accustomed to have emblems of mortality placed near them at their entertainments. Our need is probably as great, but it is met in a different way. Death comes in his own solemn form, and lays his icy hand on our most valued fellow-worshipers. Within the last week we have lost two who would have been with us if life and health had been spared. One was a venerable lady on whose high qualities I dare not trust myself to speak. But you will form some idea of them when I tell you that at one period of her life she learned to read the Christian Scriptures in the original in order that she might go to the the purest source of truth. The other friend, Mr. Jeffery, whose sudden departure we all mourn, was respected by us for the zeal with which he filled various offices in our body, and by his other fellow-citizens for his usefulness and

ability in public life. These are warnings to work the work of Him who sent us while it is day. The events to which I have alluded, deeply as we may feel them, ought not to depress us. We are here to cherish aspirations in which our departed friends would have joined—aspirations for greater zeal, for nobler impulses, for a higher and purer life. Around me I see many who will aid us to-night in the objects before us. We have our eloquent instructor of the morning, Mr. Gaskell, whom we cannot hear too often. We have our own minister, Mr. Odgers, and other friends from a distance, to whom we have been often indebted. We have to express our acknowledgments to the scientific skill, the genius, the taste, which have been exercised in making our little temple so beautiful. It will therefore be enough for me to propose to you the sentiment which it was thought might fitly be the first this evening: "Success to our great objects as a Christian Society,—Practical Religion, Pure Devotion, Charity, Knowledge and Truth. May our renovated Chapel be a faithful emblem of renewed attachment in our own hearts and minds to whatsoever is lovely and of good report!"

Rev. W. J. Odgers proposed, and Rev. E. Chapman seconded, a resolution, "That the best thanks of the meeting be given to the Rev. W. Gaskell for his able, impressive and appropriate sermon, accompanied by the most hearty wishes for the prosperity of his various labours at Manchester." It was stated that both the Bath congregation and their friends from other places were greatly indebted to Mr. Gaskell for devoting so much valuable time to their common cause.

Rev. W. Gaskell, in responding, said, that the cause with which he had identified himself was more and more endeared to his head and his heart, his mind and his conscience. He scarcely deserved thanks, because it was a great pleasure to him to visit his friends at Bath, to witness the efforts they were making, and to be one of the first worshipers in their beautiful chapel. It was pleasant to him to have their greetings connected with work which was very interesting to him at Manchester. In various movements in which he had taken part for the moral and social improvement of the working classes, he was sure he should have the sympathy of the meeting. He had lately had frequent opportunities of observing signs of progress, and he had come to the conclusion that never was there greater cause for hope. The instance presented to them to-day was extremely gratifying. *Much zeal* had been shewn in a most worthy object. In the building dedicated anew to the highest objects in life, there was a display of no common architectural taste and skill. And as the outer, material church had been so much improved, he trusted that there would be no deficiency in the inner, spiritual structure. Let those who there worship together see how they can build up each other in the faith they mutually love, in the virtues they are bound to practise. Let them strengthen the hands of their minister in any labours of charity and duty to which, in the exercise of his office, he may feel himself called. This was the best mode of shewing the superfluousness of the great amount of pity lately bestowed upon them by their orthodox brethren as an almost extinguished sect. Men like Dr. Vaughan, and other writers in the *British Quarterly Review*, would then see that we were not so far gone as they supposed. Those gentlemen reminded him of a medical friend of his who visited a patient, and after the usual professional routine of ascertaining symptoms, &c., left him with the assurance that he was in a bad way and required great care. The wife of the patient was duly impressed with the melancholy announcement, but could not keep her husband at home. Calling the next day, the doctor found the supposed "sick man" out, and was of course extremely anxious. Not long after they encountered each other in the street. The truth was, that so far from being persuaded he was very ill, the would-not-be-patient said he was never better in his life. Dr. Vaughan might apply this anecdote. So as to Mr. Isaac Taylor's republication of old charges and misrepresentations. Was it creditable in such a man or in any man to ignore all that had taken place during the last twenty or thirty years? Why were the signs of vitality indicated by their city missions, by many of their congregations, and by their undoubted influence on the theology of the day, to be overlooked? Both in the Church and out of it, no small number of students and young ministers were breaking through the trammels of traditional religion and determined to judge for themselves. How nearly did the various Oxford men who were putting forth reviews and essays, approach Unitarian modes of thought, though they were unconscious of it themselves! Turning to the practical usefulness of those modes of thought, Mr. Gaskell dwelt on the good that was being done in the north of England by the diminution of scepticism. Large numbers who had been driven to unbelief by the prevalent creeds, had found strength and consolation in the simple and

rational truths of Unitarian Christianity. To promote objects like these was one great aim of his life, and he cordially thanked the meeting for the sympathy with him which they had shewn.

Mr. JOLLY then proposed a hearty welcome to friends from a distance, which was enforced by Mr. R. P. EDWARDS and responded to by the Rev. W. JAMES, who spoke of the pleasant intercourse he had enjoyed with the Bath congregation for more than thirty years, during the ministry successively of Mr. Hunter, Mr. Murch, Mr. Wallace and Mr. Odgers. He trusted that all before him who admired the chapel which had been re-opened in the morning, and no one could avoid admiring it, would contribute in proportion to their means to prevent that serious incumbrance, a debt. Let the effort to prevent this be made thoroughly, and made, if possible, at once.

Rev. J. L. SHORT next addressed to the meeting a most thoughtful and earnest speech on the signs of the times. After which, the meeting rendered a tribute of gratitude to W. J. Green, Esq., for his architectural skill in restoring the chapel. It was stated that, with original materials little better than four bare walls, Mr. Green had produced a most elegant building. To the father of this gentleman, who had been long a member of the congregation, the success which in this and other instances was attending his professional exertions must be a source of great pleasure.—Mr. W. J. Green, in thanking the meeting, expressed the more than professional interest he had felt in the work, and the high satisfaction with which he received the sentiments of the congregation.

This report would be sadly imperfect if it omitted to notice a circumstance indicative of the cordial feeling existing between the Rev. W. J. Odgers and his flock. In connection with the re-opening of the chapel they had presented him with a handsome silk gown, and Mrs. Odgers with a valuable gold bracelet, accompanied by an address illuminated on vellum. Mr. Odgers acknowledged these marks of esteem with much feeling. He dwelt on the value which he attached to the support and sympathy of his congregation. With reference to this subject, it was proposed by him, and seconded by Mr. Green, "That the warm and cordial thanks of the meeting be presented to their excellent Treasurer, Mr. Murch, for his generous and unwearied efforts to promote the prosperity of the congregation, and especially for his unceasing attention during the alterations of the chapel, and his successful endeavours to procure the needful funds." Mr. Murch, in reply, assured the meeting that he should always prize the good opinion of a society with whom he had been so long and so closely connected. And with reference to the kind remark of Mr. Green that he had been instrumental in making Unitarians better known and more respected by their fellow-townsmen, he said that few men with his opinions could have experienced during a public life of nearly thirty years less intolerance or unpleasantness. His late appointment to the Presidency of the Bath Hospital, one of the oldest and noblest institutions in the kingdom, rejoiced him peculiarly, because it was a proof of great liberality; the congratulations he had received from all parties were most hearty and sincere; and he mentioned it as an encouragement to his friends around him in any trials of their faith and patience which they might have to encounter.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN SCHOOL SOCIETY.

This Society held its annual meeting, under the presidency of Lord John Russell, on Monday, May 7. The proceedings of the Committee during the past year in declining to respect the recommendation made to them on a former occasion, and enforced by the authority of Lord Granville and other noble supporters of the institution, to withdraw from the depository certain works which compromise the catholic and non-sectarian character of the institution, necessitated the renewal of the protest of Unitarian members of the Society. The Committee ground their defence on the plea that "those cannot be regarded as peculiar religious tenets which are held, with few exceptions, by the entire Christian community of this country." Unfortunately for the Committee, the founders of the Society accepted the co-operation of some of those who, however few in numbers, are the "exceptions" referred to. The basis, therefore, of the proceedings of the Society must be sufficiently broad to include the possibility, without violence to conscience, of Unitarian co-operation. The doctrines of the Trinity and Atonement are openly taught in the schools; and yet the Committee represent the Society as "unsectarian but not secular, religious but not denominational," and add, strangely enough, that "this principle enters into all its arrangements and proceedings." The inconsistency was pointed out in speeches of considerable ability and equal moderation by Mr. J. C. Lawrence and Mr. H. J. Preston, who moved an amendment remitting the subject of the sale of the works

objected to, to the further consideration of the Committee. They were assailed with the interruptions and marks of dislike which are generally elicited from the excitable sensibilities of a London religious meeting when a point involving an attack on orthodox opinions is raised. Amidst much clamour, they persevered in a manner that called forth from one of their opponents, Sir Walter Stirling, a tribute to the courage and "pluck" of Messrs. Lawrence and Preston, and awarded them the "honours of the day" for their "stout resistance." Lord John Russell declined, as Chairman, to give an opinion on the merits of the Committee. A Mr. John Corderoy, one of the Committee, rated the mover and seconder of the amendment in not the gentlest terms, for coming to that public meeting to interfere with its proceedings; maintained that the Roman Catholics were well able to defend themselves; that the doctrines of the Trinity and Atonement could not be regarded as peculiar opinions, as they were recognized by the mass of the Christian world; and that in teaching these doctrines the Committee had not in any degree departed from the principles on which the Society was founded. We regret we cannot find space for the whole proceedings. They were well reported in the *Inquirer* of May 19. Only four hands were held up for the amendment. If the Committee were gratified by the victory of numbers, the Unitarian minority may congratulate themselves on having the advantage in argument and principle.

LONDON DOMESTIC MISSION SOCIETY.

The annual sermons on behalf of this valuable charity were preached on Sunday, May 13, by the Rev. Robert Ainslie, of Brighton, and were listened to with gratified attention by numerous audiences, in the morning at Portland-Street chapel, and in the evening at Essex-Street chapel. Liberal collections were made on each occasion. On the evening of the following day, the annual meeting was held at Radley's Hotel, and the attendance was unusually large. The duties of the chair were most ably filled by Mr. W. A. Case, who introduced the proceedings of the evening by an address, of which we can give only the concluding passages, as reported in the columns of the *Inquirer*. In referring to their missionaries he said: Mr. Corkran, as they all knew, was a veteran in their service, and he had given time and energy and strength to it; and they knew that in Mr. Broome he had an *efficient fellow*-labourer. All that they could do was not merely to thank them; it was to place at their disposal the means of greater usefulness, and to take care that neither they nor the Committee were crippled for want of sympathy and aid which it might be in their power to bestow. Before he closed he would simply say, let them consider what was missionary work; let them understand what was the purpose for which they met this evening; and he thought he could not do it better than by asking them to "look upon this picture and upon that." Let them for one moment picture to themselves homes, if they could give that holy name to such places as he spoke of—homes without home—places of sickness and suffering, but for the blessed agency of their Mission almost without relief—childhood like some delicate flower trailing in the dirt for want of timely aid—manhood developing irreligion and irreverence, knowing only God's name or using it only to blaspheme—all the sin and the vice and the degradation which stood amongst the fearful blotches of this our civilization. Then let them turn to the other picture; let them think of their own homes, guarded, sheltered, blessed with all the sweet amenities of life, order, love, obedience, troops of friends—their own childhood, with all the love that sheltered it—their own children, whom they watched over so jealously, and around whom they gathered so many shields and so much protection, so that nothing unholy or unclean might mar the freshness of their spirits; and then let them compare these two pictures, and if they had the love of Christ in them, and had that love constraining them, he thought they should say reverently and humbly, "We are what we are by the grace of God;" and they should pray from the depths of their hearts to be delivered from temptation, the temptation of their position—for deliverance from selfishness and sloth, lest great talents be abused, and their own choicest blessings become their greatest condemnation.

The Treasurer's report, read by Mr. P. Worsley, shewed that the income of the Society had been £1024. 14*s.* 1*d.*, and its expenditure £938. 11*s.* 3*d.*, leaving a balance in the Treasurer's hands of £86. 2*s.* 10*d.*, being a diminution of balance in hand of about £37; but as the Society was this year debited with about £50 through the failure in 1856 of the Royal British Bank, the account is in no respect unsatisfactory. Mr. H. Enfield then read the Committee's report, and Mr. Corkran and Mr. Broome, the indefatigable missionaries, read theirs, which were of the usual mingled and interesting character, describing toilsome and anxious labours, of which the

was not always visible, but which, as they are in the purest faith and will not be permitted by the great of the harvest to perish, but will ter produce the precious fruits of ousness. Of the missionaries' reports y perhaps have a future opportunity aking. The adoption of the report oved in an able speech by Rev. Jas. sen and seconded by Rev. R. B. d.—In moving the thanks of the r to Mr. Ainslie for his discourses of evious day, Dr. Sadler said that the ecourse he had the opportunity and asure of hearing was characterized nd views and a most humane spirit, g that the great object of the er was to bring home to mankind a l principle of Christianity, love to nd love to man.—The motion having econded by Mr. J. C. Lawrence, was nously adopted, and was suitably redged by Mr. Ainslie, who next ded to move an expression of sym- with the missionaries, and gave a of the growth and working of the ission, with which he had been for ears associated. It was gratifying supporters of the Domestic Mission n from this experienced and most e observer, that he was certain that moral statistics relating to Spital- f thirty years ago and the present ould be contrasted, there would be reason for the highest congratula- nd thankfulness to Almighty God for eat change that had taken place.— nding the motion, Mr. Jas. Yates, y to the mover of the first resolution, ated the spirit of Protestantism in ing with social evils, and described its of a very gratifying character had fallen under his individual —Rev. J. J. Tayler moved a resolu- cognizing the usefulness of the Mis- nd satisfaction at the extension of sary movements.—In seconding the , Mr. Nettlefold referred to the ion of the schools in connection with rter-Lane congregation, and to the leness of their being, in case of the l of the congregation to a distant r, taken under the fostering wing of mestic Mission.—An addition to the ion was subsequently moved by Mr. Preston, seconded by Mr. Alfred ce, and supported by Rev. Henry recommending the formation of a mission in the vicinity of Carter —Mr. H. Enfield expressed doubts ing the power of the Society to enter ent on such an extension of their the increased expenditure such an on would entail was beyond their means. Already their payments were felt to be scanty. He would rather therefore look to a separate and independent movement for carrying on the good work so well begun by the Carter-Lane congregation.—The amendment having been withdrawn, with the understanding that the subject involved in it would, when the time for action came, not be overlooked by the Committee, the original resolution was carried.—On the motion of Rev. T. L. Marshall, who expressed a wish to see a mission established in a district on the other side of the water, seconded by Mr. Richard Martineau, the officers for the year were appointed, a vote of thanks to the Chairman was passed, and the proceedings of the evening came to a close.

THE ULSTER UNITARIAN SOCIETY FOR THE DIFFUSION OF CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

We are happy in being able to report that the proceedings of the anniversary at Belfast of this useful Society, on Sunday, May 6, and Tuesday, May 8, have been harmonious, spirited and pre-eminently successful. It will be remembered that last year the apple of discord was too successfully thrown amongst the members, and that the proceedings which then ensued excited some angry feeling, which unhappily was not allowed to confine itself to the Irish side of the Channel. Much painful misunderstanding was the result. This year the Society was allowed without disturbance to carry on its proper work, and the result was most satisfactory to all the true friends of religious progress. The sermons were preached by Rev. Samuel Martin, of Trowbridge. A Belfast correspondent of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association has thus characterized Mr. M.'s services on the occasion: "The Society and our cause in this town is deeply indebted to him. Services more able, more energetic, more appropriate, have seldom graced our annual gatherings. Mr. Martin is a right-minded and true-hearted Englishman. He is not afraid to speak out plain, honest truth, nor ashamed to speak it in his simple mother tongue. There was not a sentence or a phrase in his discourses which the servants and working people who attend our chapel services could not thoroughly understand; while they displayed a power and vigour of thought which carried with them the approving sympathy of our best-educated members. His visit to us here has done us a great deal of good. Not merely the Society which invited him to preach at its anniversary, but our Domestic Mission to the Poor and the Unitarian Young Men's Christian Association,

have benefited by his labours and suggestions."

On Tuesday evening, May 8, the public meeting was held in the First Presbyterian meeting-house, under the presidency of Mr. James M. Darbishire. The same correspondent from whom we have just quoted states—"The best spirit prevailed. The speeches delivered were animated and impressive, and had a direct bearing on the present very critical position of the Unitarian cause on both sides of the Channel. They were received with the cordial approbation of one of the most numerous assemblages ever held in any of our places of worship on a similar occasion A most excellent Committee has been chosen to conduct the affairs of the Society for the next twelve months; and it is to be hoped that it will henceforth be enabled to pursue its unostentatious but useful career, unimpeded by those difficulties which for the last two years have beset its path and obstructed its labours."

We take the report of the speeches from the *Northern Whig* of May 9, of which an abbreviation only has hitherto been presented to Unitarian readers. The proceedings commenced with religious exercises.

The CHAIRMAN said—I have great pleasure in presiding on this occasion, feeling deeply interested in the welfare of this Society, and in the diffusion of that holy, pure and simple doctrine which we believe our Lord Jesus Christ taught on earth, and which it is the object of this Society to disseminate—the belief that there is but one God, the Father Almighty, and one Saviour, Christ Jesus, the only Mediator between God and man, who died for us, and gave us the promise of the life to come. This is a simple and reasonable doctrine, and ought to recommend itself to all reasonable minds. It is calculated to sanctify our lives, elevate our minds, and lead us on in the path of duty to God and man. Holding such a faith, it is our duty to do all we can to extend its influence, and to draw as many followers into our fold as possible. Much good has been done through the agency of your excellent Secretary and Committee. Much, however, remains to be accomplished, for there are many who raise their voices against us; but I trust that all those who really value our religions will manfully uphold them, and by their lives and conduct prove to those who differ from them that our religion is a religion of holiness and true faith, of peace and love to God and to all our fellow-beings.

Rev. Mr. M'ALESTER, the Secretary, then read the report, of which the following is the more important portion:—"The Committee of the Unitarian Society for the Diffusion of Christian Knowledge, in retiring from the office which had been a second time entrusted to them, have pleasure in being able to report favourably respecting the operation of the Society during the past year. It will be found by the Treasurer's statement of accounts that the sales have been greater than in any preceding year, having amounted to £144. 2*s.* 5*d.* It should be a source of gratification to the friends of this Society to know that, through its instrumentality, books to such an amount, in explanation and defence of the simple and rational views of Christian truth which the Society represents, have obtained circulation in our neighbourhood; when otherwise little could have been done, beyond the ministrations of the pulpit, to correct prevailing misapprehension, and to counteract the vigorous efforts that are everywhere made to injure our faith. In the course of the past year, 24,560 tracts have been printed, chiefly new editions of tracts formerly printed by the Society. A quantity of the various publications of the late Mr. Harris has lately been added to the stock of the Society's tracts; and many of these will be found most suitable for general circulation.

"While the Committee have endeavoured to promote the doctrinal views which it is a great object of this Society to maintain, they have also been desirous of circulating as much as possible works of a devotional and practical character. The attitude of defence which our denomination is continually obliged to assume against those who assail its principles, has a tendency to draw off the mind from the consolatory and sanctifying influences of the gospel, and many thus associate Unitarianism only with a controversy against Trinitarian and Calvinistic doctrines; but while we justly prize those simple and scriptural views of God and his revelation by Jesus Christ which recommend themselves equally to the understanding and the heart, and while we feel constrained to profess and uphold them, we would not forget that the higher province of religion is to regulate and direct the life, to sustain us amid the trials to which we are exposed, to comfort us in seasons of sorrow and suffering, and to strengthen in the soul hopes full of immortality. With these views, the Committee contemplated the publication of a collection of short Prayers suited for family worship, which might be sold at a very low price; and they would express a hope that the Committee for the ensuing year may be able to accomplish this object, as well as to issue a series of tracts designed to foster the devotional spirit and enforce the practical duties of religion.

"The attention of the Committee was drawn to the Rules of the Society, with the view of having certain alterations made in them; and after giving the matter very careful consideration, they have unanimously agreed to recommend to this annual meeting that the sixth Rule, which directs that a catalogue should be published annually, in which the prices to subscribers and non-subscribers shall be marked, be omitted; and that for the third Rule the following be substituted: 'The Society shall be supported by annual subscriptions. Every subscriber of *two shillings and sixpence* or upwards, yearly, shall be a member of the Society from the date of payment of such subscription. All subscriptions shall be payable in advance, and shall be considered as due on the first day of April in each year, and shall be understood to be continued annually, unless notice to the contrary be given to the Secretary. No member shall be entitled to vote at any meeting who shall be more than twelve months in arrear; neither shall any person be entitled to vote at any meeting till he has been three months a member of the Society.'

"In giving up the trust which they have endeavoured faithfully and efficiently to discharge, your Committee would express a sincere hope that their successors may more zealously and successfully promote the objects of the Society. There never was a time in these countries when it was more important to hold fast the rational and scriptural doctrines of our simple faith. Extravagant and unreasonable views of Christianity are actively disseminated; and many, turning away from dogmas that shock the reasoning powers which the Creator has bestowed on them, and that do violence to the affections He has implanted in their breasts, pass into the dreary wilderness of unbelief. It is therefore incumbent upon us to keep prominently before the world that faith which represents the Father as the only true God, gratefully recognizes the divine mission of Jesus Christ, and receives those sublime doctrines and holy precepts which were inculcated by the lips, exemplified in the life, sealed by the death and confirmed by the resurrection of our Lord and Saviour."

Michael Andrews, Esq., then read the statement of the account with the Treasurer. Last year, the balance in hand was £17. 3*s*. 7*d*. The income had since been £279. 15*s*. 10*d*.; the expenditure, £213. 15*s*. 11*d*.; leaving a balance of £55. 19*s*. 11*d*., besides a reserve fund of £56. 16*s*. 11*d*.

Rev. Dr. Montgomery then rose to move the adoption of the report and statement of accounts. He said he felt very much gratified in being called on to do so. It was always agreeable to be connected with a Society that was in a prosperous condition; and although they had no very great success to boast of, they had evidently been making a steady progress, and he believed a secure one, both in relation to the hold that their Society had taken in the minds of their own people, and the impression that their tracts and publications of various kinds had made on the more candid portion of the public of other denominations. It was agreeable to find that the sales had amounted in one year to £144, especially when it was considered that those books were sold, in some instances, considerably below the cost price, and in relation to the tracts that they printed, at a merely nominal price. The actual value would perhaps be very nearly double that of £144. One great object of the Society was to bring religious information within the reach of the masses of the people, both of their own church and of churches around; and it was, in point of fact, for that purpose that the annual collections were made and annual subscriptions received, that they might reduce the prices of these publications, so as to bring them within the reach of a large body of the people. He learned that so many as 24,000 tracts had been printed by the Society during the last year, and he believed 16,000 publications of various kinds had been gratuitously distributed; so they would perceive that the sales, even at the reduced prices, would give but a very small idea of the extent of the good they were doing in sending forth rational views of Christianity to the world. He felt that they would be pleased with this the more from what was referred to in the report, from the efforts that were made to injure their faith. He did not know that they should be at all very much displeased with those efforts, even though they proceeded in many cases to the extent of the most amazing misrepresentation. He was not at present about to say that this misrepresentation was always wilful, but, at all events, it was misrepresentation proceeding from the grossest ignorance. Views the most directly opposed to those they entertained were attributed to them. For instance, he found that they were accused very largely of denying the Bible, whereas, of all Christians in the world, the Unitarians were those who attached the greatest value to the sacred Scriptures. They had no creeds, no comments, no authoritative interpretation of creeds, to place before their people or to place above the Scriptures. But, on the contrary, they said

that the Scriptures in themselves constitute the words of eternal life, and they received them as God's teaching for man's present good and everlasting salvation. They took the Scriptures for their guide; whatever they found therein, to that they said "Yea;" to whatever they did not find, though supported by the authority of all the churches in the world, they said "Nay." They were truly Bible Christians, and it was a gross libel to say that they undervalued or denied the sacred writings. Another charge was, that they denied their Saviour. This was equally false with the other. In truth, they were accused of denying the Lord Jesus Christ, simply because they allowed no authority but him in their church. One was their Master, even Christ, and they were all brethren. It was of importance that they should be able to refute the calumnies that they denied the efficacy and the divine mission in the life and death of their Lord Jesus. He believed of all denominations of Christians they were the denomination that gave the Lord Jesus Christ the highest reverence, for they received him as he was offered unto them in the gospel—the Son of God, the Saviour of the world from sin—not from the wrath of God, for God loved us from the first, and God would love us to the last—but they believed he came to save them from their sins—not to save them, as many alleged, in their sins and in spite of their transgressions. Dr. Montgomery then proceeded to say it was somewhat complimentary that they should be so misrepresented; for if facts would answer the purpose—namely, of bringing them into reproach—their calumniators would not have recourse to misrepresentation. He pointed out the position which Unitarianism occupied as a rational faith, standing between scepticism and infidelity on the one hand, and latitudinarianism and fanaticism on the other. He gave a strong preference to fanaticism, as against the infidelity which exists in the world; and having described, in high terms of praise, the characters of Messrs. Armstrong and Harris, and also Dr. Hutton, whose deaths were referred to in the report, he exhorted his audience in earnest terms to cultivate the spirit and practice of prayer and of dependence in God.

Mr. H. Darbishire seconded the motion for the adoption of the report, which was at once carried.

Rev. William Bruce then said he had been deputed to return the thanks of the Society to their friend Mr. Martin, of Trowbridge, for coming such a distance, and for the admirable discourses—the results of his coming here—which so many of them had heard. He had heard the second of these discourses, and was most highly pleased with its admirable spirit, with its earnestness of spirit, and its plain and decided tone of religious sentiment—with the energy both of body and mind, the perspicuity with which it was expressed, so different from the metaphysical subtleties so common now-a-days, especially amongst Mr. Martin's brethren in England, where it was called eloquence, which it would seem to be called from the inability to understand it. Every word of Mr. Martin's discourse was well understood from its being plain Saxon-English, without any German importations. Mr. Martin seemed to be afraid, as he was speaking in the same downright simplicity and plainness here that he did in his own parish, that he might be giving offence. He (Mr. Bruce) could assure him that he could never give offence to any of their congregations by the greatest plainness of speech. There was nothing they wished to have more than the greatest plainness of speech in stating their duties, and where there was a failure in the discharge of them, and in the urging of reformation and amendment. He would therefore move that the best thanks of their Society were due and are hereby given to the Rev. Samuel Martin, of Trowbridge, for his admirable discourses preached on behalf of that Society, and that they offer him their hearty congratulations on his being still blessed with such vigour of body and energy of spirit, for watching over his most interesting charge at Trowbridge. Their friend Dr. Montgomery had said that the memory of those gentlemen recorded in the report should stimulate them, and be a lesson to them; he (Mr. Bruce) hoped that Mr. Martin's appearance amongst them, and the energy with which he had gone forward in the discharge of all his duties, would be of still greater use to them.

Mr. Spackman seconded the motion, which was carried without the formality of being put from the chair.

Mr. Martin, who was received with applause, expressed, in returning thanks, the pleasure which it had given him to be present personally amongst those with whom his heart was united. He mentioned the difficulty he had in getting away from his people at home; but when he said he was going to Ireland to their friend Mr. Andrews, such was his (Mr. Andrews') popularity, they said they would not throw the least obstacle in the way. Mr. Martin, in conclusion, counselled his hearers to energy and activity, to the cultivation of a prayerful disposition, a dependence in God, cheerful liberality in support of the

Society, correct doctrinal views, and the keeping up of their schools. He concluded by pronouncing his blessing on all present.

Mr. W. J. C. Allen, J.P., moved the next resolution:—"That we believe that the Scriptures plainly teach that the Father is the only true God, and that Jesus Christ is divinely appointed to be the Saviour of the world, and that it is incumbent on us not merely to profess these rational and strictly evangelical doctrines, but to labour in the spirit of Christian charity, and yet with Christian firmness and zeal, to maintain and extend them." Mr. Allen said—Sir, it may appear somewhat strange that we should feel it necessary to make a declaration of our fundamental belief at the present time. The resolution which I have read affirms that the Scriptures plainly teach that the Father is the only true God, and that Jesus Christ is the divinely appointed Saviour of the world, and involves two propositions at its commencement. First, it involves the proposition that we believe in the Scriptures, and certainly the other proposition that the Scriptures teach certain doctrines. Some years ago it might have been necessary for us to declare that we believe in the Scriptures, but I am not quite prepared to agree with my reverend friend Dr. Montgomery in saying that we are set down as unbelievers in the Scriptures, as we were some twenty-five or thirty years ago. I believe that a movement is going on in the churches around us among those who hold different views, and that those who may have once held the opinion would be sorry now to say that we do not believe the Scriptures. While I don't believe it is necessary that we should express our belief in the Scriptures, there is a movement going on among those who call themselves Christians that makes this absolutely necessary. I believe that, in the little attention I am able to give to these matters, there is a class of persons who call themselves Christians, who would take it as a very great insult to be denied the Christian name, yet who write what appears to me to be the very opposite of the Christian character. I believe writings are propagated now-a-days by professing Christians who do all they can to disparage and throw discredit upon the Christian religion. I find it stated that the historical writings of the New Testament are little else than fables; that the writers have composed romances and have exalted one person at the expense of another; and they go on to say that the very grounds upon which our Lord Jesus Christ himself appealed in support of his divine authority are necessarily false. We find our Saviour telling the disciples of John, who were sent to him to inquire who he was, "Go and tell John what ye do see and hear—the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised, and to the poor the gospel is preached." Such is the declaration—such the appeal made to his own works by the Saviour as to his divine authority; yet the writers to whom I am now referring deny that any of these facts did occur or could occur; and yet they say they are Christians. They deny the resurrection of Jesus Christ himself. They declare that no such fact ever occurred. They torture their ingenuity to fix reasons for the disappearance of the body from the tomb—a fact they cannot venture to deny—and they even go so far as to suggest the very reason that was suggested to the mind of the watchers of the Roman governor—that the disciples may have come and removed the body by night. Sir, when I find such writers claiming the Christian name, I cannot understand it; when they declare their contempt for the teachings of the Scriptures, when they charge the author of that gospel with making false claims of honour in regard to his works, I don't understand how they can say that his was a perfect moral character when his whole life, his whole teachings, according to their doctrine, appeared to have been a lie. Sir, this is to me a very painful subject. It cannot be a very agreeable one to those I see around me, and who, I believe, entertain very different views on these subjects; but it is necessary, I think, that our principles should be made known, time after time, so long as there exists such claimants to the Christian name who do entertain and promulgate such doctrines. It is necessary to warn many that such doctrines are promulgated. It will be at once seen that such teachings are likely to produce a very prejudicial effect upon our body, and that it is necessary in consequence that we, as Unitarian Christians, should declare that we believe in the Scriptures—that we believe that the Scriptures plainly teach that the Father is the only true God—that Jesus Christ is divinely appointed to be the Saviour of the world—that it is incumbent on us not merely to profess these rational and strictly evangelical doctrines, but to labour in the spirit of Christian charity, and yet with Christian firmness and zeal, to maintain and extend them. Sir, having said so much, and having detained you so long, I don't think it necessary to detain you longer on the other part of the subject, which declares it our duty to promulgate with all Christian charity and zeal the truths that we hold. I believe

the doctrine of man's responsibility extends so far as this, that if we know the truth ourselves, if we feel its effects, it is our duty to spread it by all the means in our power, and to prevail upon those around us to return from the error of their ways.

Mr. JAMES HUNTER seconded the resolution, which was carried unanimously.

Mr. M'ALESTER moved, and Mr. A. O'D. TAYLOR seconded, the next resolution, which had reference to the changing of the terms of one of the minor Rules of the Association.

The Committee for the next year having been balloted for, on the motion of Mr. ALLEN, J.P., Mr. Darbishire left the chair, and Mr. M'Fadden was called thereto; and a vote of thanks having been passed to Mr. Darbishire, the meeting closed by the Rev. Mr. Martin pronouncing the benediction.

QUEEN'S PATENT FOR PRINTING THE BIBLE.

We hear with unmingled regret, and certainly not without surprise, that the Patent, against which a Committee of the House of Commons recently reported, has been renewed, and in a more objectionable form than before, not being limited as to time. In these days of free-trade and fearless competition, it seems a strange anachronism to surround the Bible with the miserable pretence of *protection* which a Royal Patent for printing confers. If there be one book in the world which will ensure for itself frequent and careful reprints, it is the Bible, provided the production of copies of it is left to the natural operation of the law of demand and supply. The objection that imperfect and erroneous copies will, under the operation of free-trade in Bible printing, get into circulation, is more specious than real. The Royal Patent has never secured immaculate copies of the Bible. Under it have issued some editions containing very gross errors of the press. Under the system of protection, these editions have been of necessity circulated. But supposing they had had to encounter the competition which free-trade would have ensured of more correct editions, they would have been discredited at once and their sale stopped. The outlay on the printing of the Bible is so enormous, that none but large capitalists can undertake the work; and the adventure of a single edition is so serious, that self-interest will make the publisher careful to secure a careful revision of the press and the immediate correction of errors subsequently discovered. We hope that active steps will be immediately taken by the friends of religion in England to obtain the cancelling of this objectionable patent. The arguments for it, founded on the history of the printing of the Revised Translation, are not so strong as is commonly supposed. We take an interesting statement on the subject from a paper recently read by Mr. James Heywood before the Anglo-Biblical Institute, and now published.

"Mr. Charles Childs, the eminent printer, states in his evidence before the select Committee of the House of Commons, on the Queen's printers' patent, that the King's printer, of the time of James the First, had paid for the original version of the Bible, which was completed in 1611, and that no portion whatever of the expense of printing that version had been paid, either by the King or by the State, as was commonly supposed. The evidence on this subject is somewhat complex, but it is negatively proved by the total absence of any record of any sum having been paid either from the privy purse of King James the First, or by the State, for the expense of printing a version of the Bible.

"The same witness informed the Committee that Mr. Ball, in a book printed in 1561, and submitted to the Parliament of England, mentioned that he conceives the sole printing of the Bible and Testament, with power of restraint in others, to be of right the property of one Matthew Barker, citizen and stationer of London, in regard that his father paid for the amended or corrected translation of the Bible £3500, by reason whereof the translated copy did belong to him and his assignees. Herbert says that this was the amount paid for making the new translation.

"Under Queen Elizabeth, patents of privilege were granted for printing, like any other trade monopolies of the time, which were granted, for special reasons, by the Crown. The patent was for the benefit of the patentee, and not for any other purpose whatever. In 1577, Jugge, the Queen's printer for the first time, made the statement that a Bible was 'set forth by authority;' of which authority there is not the slightest indication, except that the Primate Grindal had favoured him, and had probably given him authority to set whatever value he could upon that Bible.

"Mr. Childs farther observes, in his evidence, that there is no indication of the patent having originally referred to the question of the accuracy, or to the necessity of having a pure copy of the Scriptures. The Royal prerogative did not enable the Crown to grant a patent for printing the Bible, nor is there by common

law any property whatever of copyright; in fact, copyright was created, by statute, in 8 Anne, 1710, so that King James, in 1611, could have had no right, either by prerogative or property, to grant an exclusive patent of Bible printing.

"A drawback of 1½*d.* per lb. avoirdupois is allowed by Act of Parliament, 2 & 3 Vict. c. 23, on the paper used at the University printing-presses of Oxford, Cambridge and Dublin, as well as by the Queen's printers in England and Ireland, and under the sanction of the Bible Board of Scotland. The printed works consist of Bibles, Testaments, Prayer-books, Confessions of Faith, &c., and include, in the case of the Universities, books in Latin, Greek, Oriental and Northern languages.

"Dr. Greenhill, M.D., of Trinity College, Oxford, remarks in his evidence published by the Oxford University Royal Commission, in 1852, that 'after having, for many years, taken an especial interest in the proceedings of the University press, he is disposed to believe that it will be found, upon inquiry, that there is no establishment in Europe which, upon the whole, does so little for the promotion of literature, in comparison with the vast means at its command.'

"On an average of seven years, ending at Michaelmas, 1851, the yearly income of the University of Cambridge, arising from the profits of its press, all of which belongs to the University, amounted to £895. 0*s.* 5*d.* At Oxford, the larger part of the profits of the press belongs to the University, and the learned portion of the press is its sole property. In the department of printing Bibles and Prayer-books, the University of Oxford has partners, who are familiar with the business; the revenue from this department was estimated by the Royal Commissioners, in 1852, at not less than £8000 a-year. A considerable portion of the accumulated profits of the press has been recently devoted by the University to the improvement of the scientific and fine-arts' galleries and museums at Oxford."

MARRIAGES.

March 25, at Lord-Street chapel, Oldham, by Rev. C. W. Robberds, JAMES, son of the late Jonathan TAYLOR, of Mill Hill, near Oldham, to ELIZABETH, daughter of the late John KINDER, of Staley, near Mottram.

April 1, at the Elder-Yard chapel, Chesterfield, by Rev. F. Bishop, Mr. ALFRED TAYLOR, of Chesterfield, to Miss MARY COATES, of Brompton.

April 14, at Brixton, by Rev. Dr. Harrison, WILLIAM, son of William TENNANT, Esq., of Upper Grove Lane, Camberwell, to HARRIET, second daughter of Augustus Jackson WHITE, Esq., of Roupell Park, Streatham Hill.

April 18, at the parish church, Bradford, by Rev. Dr. Burnet, vicar, CHARLES, youngest son of the late Benjamin HEAPE, Esq., of Rochdale, to ELIZABETH, youngest daughter of the late Joseph WADE, Esq., of Bradford.

April 24, at the Old meeting-house, Mansfield, by Rev. A. W. Worthington, B.A., JOHN EDWIN, eldest son of Mr. John BIRKS, of Mansfield, to CHARLOTTE MARY, eldest daughter of Mr. Job HODGKINSON, of Two Oaks' Farm, near Mansfield.

April 25, at the Upper chapel, Sheffield, GEORGE EADON, Esq., of Tapton, to Mrs. ELIZA HINDE, of Upperthorpe.

May 2, at the Unitarian chapel, Blackwater Street, Rochdale, by Rev. S. F. Macdonald, JOHN, second son of Thomas STANDRING, Esq., of Timperley, to SARAH, youngest daughter of the late Benjamin HEAPE, Esq., of Rochdale.

May 6, at the Unitarian church, Newhall Hill, Birmingham, by Mr. J. Green, Mr. HENRY HICKMAN, late of India, to CAROLINE GRIFFITHS, of Birmingham.

May 8, at the New Meeting-house, Birmingham, by Rev. James Martineau, Mr. THOMAS MARTINEAU, solicitor, eldest son of Robert Martineau, Esq., of Edgbaston, to EMILY, eldest daughter of Timothy KENRICK, Esq., of Maple Bank, Edgbaston.

May 12, at Leicester, by Rev. G. M'All, HENRY EDGAR, second son of Mr. John BIRKS, of Mansfield, to SARAH, daughter of Mr. ROBERTS, surveyor, of the same town.

May 19, at the Unitarian church, Hackney, by Rev. R. Brook Aspland, M.A., Mr. CHARLES LIVESEY COLE, of Camden Town, to CATHERINE, third daughter of the late Mr. William EARLES, of the Bank of England.

OBITUARY.

Jan. 15, at Otamatea Wanganu, New Zealand, in the 58th year of his age, JOHN TYLSTON WICKSTEED, Esq., J.P. He was born in the town of Shrewsbury, and was on his mother's side a descendant of the pious Philip Henry. His father was the late Mr. John Wicksteed, of Shrewsbury, a man of fine intellectual powers, which have been inherited by more than one of his sons. The deceased whose loss we now record took his second name from Dr. Tylston, the husband of Katherine, daughter of Philip Henry. Matthew Henry, in a letter to Thoresby, described his brother-in-law Tylston as a good man, a profitable companion, a true friend and a great scholar. Mr. John Tylston Wicksteed was a pupil first of the late Rev. George Case, the Presbyterian minister of Shrewsbury, and afterwards of the distinguished Dr. Samuel Butler, the learned Master of Shrewsbury School, and afterwards Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry. After completing his education under Dr. Butler at Shrewsbury, Mr. J. T. Wicksteed was engaged in an important commercial business in the Northern and Southern of the United States. Subsequently he was, we believe, connected with the London press, being sub-editor of the *Spectator* newspaper in its palmy days. In whatever he undertook he displayed readiness and talent of a high order. As a companion, his genial disposition, large experience and varied knowledge, made him always interesting and delightful. He was many years ago induced to emigrate to the colony of New Zealand, where his talents and character secured him from the first a high position. As the conductor of a colonial newspaper, a cultivator of the soil, a magistrate and a public-spirited citizen, he wielded large influence in New Zealand, and is mourned by a wide circle of admiring friends. These are the terms in which his decease is lamented by the press of New Zealand: "It is with the deepest regret we have to announce the decease of one of our earliest settlers, our highly-esteemed fellow-colonist, John Tylston Wicksteed, Esq., J.P., who departed this life on the evening of Sunday, the 15th instant, after a brief illness, at his residence at Otamatea, in his 58th year. Ever ready wisely to suggest and energetically to forward and uphold the best interests of his fellow-settlers and adopted country; known throughout New Zealand and in other lands for his talent; open, free and upright in his *bearing*; a sound and finished scholar; an able and conscientious magistrate; richly gifted with generous emotions and the kindliest feelings for all;—such was Mr. Wicksteed. The funeral took place on Tuesday last. Universally respected, he was followed to the grave by a numerous assemblage of his friends and fellow-settlers."—Mr. Wicksteed leaves a widow and sons to lament his death.

MR. GEORGE BRANNON.

The opening of the Church of the Saviour was noticed in our number for April, and the interest of that event, peculiarly and unusually strong to the architect, acquired a melancholy tinge to him from the death of his father taking place with unexpected suddenness a few hours after the dedication services.

Mr. GEORGE BRANNON resided at Wootton, in the Isle of Wight, and expired on March 23rd, after a short illness, which had not appeared likely to result so speedily in a fatal issue. He was a man of the most scrupulous and delicate honour, of sterling integrity, of uncommon and varied talents, and throughout his life had been an uncompromising supporter of every movement for the promotion of civil and religious liberty. He was almost entirely self-educated, and in every way the "architect of his own fortune."

He was a native of Ireland, but his father being in some way implicated in the struggles of his countrymen against the English government, found it necessary to leave a comfortable position in Dublin, and work at his trade as a shoemaker in England. After a little elementary schooling, George was apprenticed to a letter-press printer. In this position he very soon shewed considerable evidences of literary, oratoric and artistic talent. The most artistic and striking sketches and portraits of persons, animals and places, are still preserved by his early acquaintances; and so brilliant were his abilities and earnest his studies, that during his apprenticeship and the first few years of his practice as a printer, he not only executed many singular, original and beautiful pieces of typography, but mastered the Latin language and some portion of Greek, studied anatomy and physiology, with Blackstone, De Lolme, and other authors on jurisprudence and law, entered deeply into the controversy of theologians, embraced the side of Priestley, Belsham and

Lindsey, and, beside all this, became an accomplished artist, equally in water and oil, in landscape and etching, and in the departments of architecture, portraits and miniatures.

At length the independence of his action made him so obnoxious that it became the chief reason for his resigning his position as manager of a printing establishment in Newport, Isle of Wight, his employers being Conservatives and having the execution of all official work.

This change urged him to bring into active exertion his talents as an author and artist. Removing to London, his first efforts were marked by the rebuffs attendant on the first attempts of authors and artists to obtain notice in the great city. But on one occasion when, broken down and disappointed, he sent his little boy with a roll of his singularly beautiful pencil sketches to an artist's shop, they were, as is generally the case, declined. The little fellow was leaving the shop when an estimable gentleman stopped him, requesting him to shew him what he had. On recognizing the romantic scenery of the Isle of Wight in those inimitable pencillings, he promptly declared they would be eminently valuable if published, and we believe this was the first suggestion which led to Mr. Brannon's numerous publications on the "Garden Isle." The first number of his royal 4to Views of the Island appeared in 1819, and was the foundation of his standard work on the Island, the "Vectis Scenery."

Without any instruction, he executed the whole of the plates with his own hand, and by the year 1824 had attained a style of etching and engraving which for freedom and sharpness of landscape work is perhaps unsurpassed by the greatest professors of the art.

About this time he removed to Southampton, and executed a magnificent set of copper-plates, royal folio, of views of the woods and mansion of East Cowes Castle, for its builder and owner, the late John Nash, Esq. The foliage of those plates can well rank with Woollett's best work; but being for strictly private circulation, after about 60 copies were taken off, the plates were destroyed. Mr. Nash was very averse to having his portrait taken; but a friend being desirous of obtaining it, engaged him in a chat, and in a few minutes Mr. Brannon secured a sketch from which he executed two elaborate miniatures, the most life-like extant of that eminent architect.

Shortly after this he purchased the little cottage and paddock where now stands Landscape Cottage, in which he breathed his last. The remainder of his life has been occupied almost wholly in publishing new topographical works, intermixed with little building speculation and occasional efforts in oil-painting and other works of art.

In all the Reform movements which excited the public till within the last ten years, he took an active and most energetic part; and it may be remarked as a gratifying circumstance that he lived to witness the triumph of the great movement for which through life he had sacrificed so much; for the present Reform Bill places the ultimate extension of the suffrage to all qualified persons without doubt.

His style of address was strongly marked by the warmth and vivacity of his countrymen, but with little of the national accent; and in his topographical writings his style was easy and agreeable, and powerfully realizing in its descriptive expressions. In a word, it will be deeply felt by all who knew him in the prime of life that a truly noble mind, whose talents and worth are but seldom surpassed, has been taken away from our midst, yet spared to see the consummation of some of his best hopes.

When age and weakness prevented his labouring with his accustomed energy at the graver, his early literary pursuits were resumed with undiminished relish, and the old book catalogues of the London dealers were regularly ransacked for books of a character that are too generally considered only endurable in the necessary literary and professional studies of young manhood. Amongst his especial favourites in his later years were Valpy's 3 vol. Greek Testament, with Latin notes; Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy; Bishop Watson's, Priestley's, Belsham's and Leland's Writings, with various anatomical, physical works. In the last eighteen months, however, his sight failed him, and in the latter part of February he became considerably weaker. During the afternoon of Tuesday, and the whole of Wednesday, he suffered considerable anguish. From that time till the dawn of Friday morning, the 23rd, there was perfect freedom from pain, and at seven o'clock his spirit passed quietly away, leaving on the pallid corpse an expression of the sweetest peace.

Of the somewhat numerous family, there survive only three sons and one daughter. Of the former, Alfred continues the publication of his topographical and artistic works; and the third son, Philip, is an architect resident at Southampton, and who first established the congregation there, and built the Church of the Saviour for its accommodation.

April 23, at Windsor, Belfast, MILLICENT GRAY, fifth daughter of Rev. John PORTER.

May 1, at Londonderry, in the 83rd year of her age, ELIZABETH, widow of the late Lieutenant and Adjutant MACLELLAN, Royal Welsh Fusiliers; and mother of the Rev. R. E. B. Maclellan, of Maidstone.

May 4, at her residence, the Elms, Camp Hill, Birmingham, DEBORAH, wife of Samuel THORNTON, Esq., aged 51 years.

The loss of this estimable lady will be severely felt, not only by her bereaved husband and children, but by a wide circle of attached friends, and by many poor persons to whom she was at all times ready to afford her benevolent sympathy and aid.

Brought up in early life in the communion and doctrines of the Established Church, she was gradually led, by her own reading and reflection, to embrace the intelligible and scriptural doctrines of Unitarian Christianity, and was habitually an earnest and devout worshiper with the congregation assembling in the New Meeting-house, of which she was a most consistent and honoured member. Ever zealous for the truth which on conviction she had embraced, she was at the same time ever charitable, both in temper and behaviour, towards all whose religious views differed from her own; and thus secured the cordial esteem of persons of every sect and party with whom her husband's public duties brought her into connection, and who enjoyed the elegant hospitalities of their genial home. Thus cherishing and illustrating in her daily life the genuine spirit of the gospel, she was well prepared for the awful summons which she so suddenly received. Returning home after a short absence with recruited health, she was struck down in a moment by apoplexy, from which she never revived to more than imperfect consciousness, and in a few hours ceased to breathe; leaving behind her a name and an influence for good which her mourning family and friends will ever affectionately cherish, and through which, though dead, she yet speaketh. "Her children, also, rise up to call her blessed."

May 4, at Soham, in the county of Cambridge, in the 70th year of his age, Rev. WILLIAM CLACK, for more than 30 years the minister of the Unitarian congregation in that town. He was born at Royston in 1791, where his father was a respectable tradesman and a member of the Church of England. What advantages of education Royston afforded we know not. Mr. Clack *enjoyed the friendship* of the late Mr. King Fordham, of that town; and if, as we suppose, that friendship began when Mr. Clack was his fellow-townsman, the fact may be taken as a proof that from an early period of life his character was such as to gain him the respect and friendly regard of his associates. As a youth, we have heard that he was timid and retiring, shewing little aptitude for the pursuits and sports commonly enjoyed with keen pleasure by youth. Peaceful, calm and serious, he looked with an admiring eye on the type of character of the members of the Society of Friends, and it is alleged, we know not with what exactness, that at one time he felt some desire to enter that amiable and useful community. This shews that he did not sympathize much with the Church-of-Englandism of his parents. He, however, soon took steps for preparing himself to enter on the Christian ministry among the orthodox Dissenters. The academy which he selected was Wymondley, probably from its convenient locality in relation to Royston. This establishment, during its existence (1799—1832) of three-and-thirty years, though conducted by tutors of rigid orthodoxy, educated several ministers who afterwards became earnest advocates of Unitarian Christianity. Whether Mr. Clack studied under Rev. W. Parry or Mr. Atkinson or Mr. Morell, we know not. But it was during his course of study that he saw reason to discard the orthodoxy of his early years and embrace a simpler and more benignant form of Christian truth. In the year 1823, he entered the ministry as a professed Unitarian, becoming the co-pastor of the late venerable Rev. S. S. Toms, for more than half a century the pastor of the congregation at Framlingham, in Suffolk. Here he devoted himself for five years to his duties with great earnestness. How thoroughly Unitarian his habits of thought and feeling were at this time is evidenced in the report which he drew up in 1825 for the Fellowship Fund at Framlingham, and which was printed in the *Christian Reformer* (12mo series, Vol. XI. pp. 243—246). His gentle and amiable disposition adapted itself pleasantly to the pastoral and co-pastoral relations. He was respected by the venerable man with whom he was associated in duty, and warmly beloved by all his flock. Although he lived at Framlingham only five years, and that more than thirty years ago, his memory is still cherished by some with respect and regard in that town; and when the tidings of his decease reached the place, all concurred in the propriety of a public tribute to his memory from the pulpit he formerly occupied, now filled by Rev. Thos. Cooper. In 1828, he was induced to remove to

Soham, to the great regret of the people then under his charge. There his father had retired on a moderate competency. Mr. Clack's parents, though at first distressed by the altered opinions of their son, learnt not only to acquiesce in the change, but even to take warm interest in his public services, which after his removal to Soham they continued to attend till the time of their death. Here also he had the society and friendship of his uncle, the late Mr. William Wilkins, an attorney, who had many years previously been led to renounce the doctrine of the Trinity consequently on hearing an attempted defence of it by the then curate of Soham.—Mr. Clack's ministry at Soham affords few incidents for the biographer to record. He devoted himself with steady but quiet energy to all his duties,—was always "apt to teach" both from the pulpit and in the little Sunday-school which he had formed. His services were, we believe, disinterestedly given almost from the first. He was after his parents' death independent in his circumstances, and was singularly free from everything like covetousness. His charities were constant. The poor, the sick and the young, were the frequent objects of his bounty. His love of children was a marked feature of his character. Without pretending to the character of a scholar, he was well-informed, especially in matters pertaining to the interpretation of the New Testament. His talents were respectable rather than brilliant; but he devoted all his powers to the study and exposition of revealed truth. His faith in the miraculous attestation of Christianity was clear and strong. He dwelt with great and increasing satisfaction on the simplicity and benignity of the faith revealed in the gospel. To those who surrounded it with mystery and enigma, he had no disposition to give heed; and he felt an utter want of sympathy with those who appeared to him to pervert the gospel by subtle speculations of a metaphysical kind. He loved in his preaching to dwell on the clearly recorded facts of the life of Jesus, and on the attributes of the Almighty, especially as He appears in the gospel revelation, a benignant Father. On the Sunday previous to his death, he preached, with his accustomed simple earnestness, a discourse on the uncertainty of life, and another on the unity and supremacy of the Father. This good man was spared the anxieties of long sickness, or of a painful and lingering breaking up of the system. He returned home from his accustomed walk, the day before his death, ill, and at daybreak on the following morning he gently breathed his last. His remains were interred in the cemetery at Soham. The last words were spoken over them by a Wesleyan minister. More than one of those ministers who sympathized with Mr. Clack's religious opinions, and who respected his worth, would, if invited, have gone to officiate at his funeral. And no arrangements were made, or permitted to be made, for a funeral sermon in the Soham chapel on the Sunday following his interment. But although they to whom Mr. Clack's property now belongs shewed their imperfect appreciation of the highest elements of his character, his fidelity to conviction and his earnest zeal in teaching what he believed to be truth, very many of his townsmen shewed by their conduct on the day of the funeral their respect for the memory of a good man; for the shops in the town were generally closed, and many followed his body to its last resting-place. Mr. Clack was present at the anniversary of the Unitarian Association last year, and during his stay in London on that occasion mentioned his desire and purpose to leave the house in which he lived, in trust for the future Unitarian minister of Soham. He did not live, however, to fulfil his purpose, and the circumstance was probably the only cause for anxiety to him in his last hour of consciousness. The disappointment of his benevolent intention may serve as a warning to all of us not to delay till to-morrow the good which we can possibly perform to-day.

May 6, in the 51st year of his age, Mr. James Jeffery, of Bath. He was hastening to reach the station at Melksham, when he was overtaken on the line by a train, was knocked by a buffer beneath the engine, and was so severely injured that he died within an hour.

The death of our friend has produced a deep and painful impression on the community in which he lived, and saddened the proceedings at the recent re-opening of his accustomed house of prayer, of the renovation of which he had been one of the most active promoters.

His attachment to the religious society with which he connected himself in early manhood, after close reading and study of the writings of eminent Trinitarian divines, was manifested by his faithful performance, to the day of his death, of his duties as a Trustee and Secretary to the chapel, Treasurer and Secretary to the Day and Sunday-schools, and to the Chapel Provident Fund. Few men were more generally respected or highly esteemed. As a citizen, he discharged his responsibilities with

a fidelity that all but trenched on the claims which business had upon him. In social life he was so morbidly anxious to do the right, that he often seemed vacillating in his opinion to those who worked with him; but no sooner did he see clearly that a duty devolved upon him than he conscientiously, punctually and cheerfully performed it. In his home he found and sustained a peace and a joy which were so unspeakably dear to him, that his sensitive nature could not disturb them by the disclosure of cares and anxieties which for the last few years weighed heavily upon his mind and heart, though these might have been dissipated immediately could he have borne to give the partner of his joys a momentary pain. Married late in life to one on whom his affections had been centred for many years, he would not permit one of the truest and best of wives to bear and soothe the sorrows, but only to share and multiply the pleasures of existence; and in a last effort to spare a blow to her whom he loved with his whole heart, he met with the accident which terminated his existence.

Mr. Jeffery was a member of the Archæological and Natural History Societies of Bath and Somerset. He had also been for many years a lay preacher to several of the smaller Unitarian congregations round Bath. His love of antiquarian research gave great zest to his country expeditions; but specially did his enthusiastic admiration of the works of God, and his strong love of country life, with its simple manners, its healthy toils, its unaffected friendships, its peaceful retirements and its unostentatious trusts, enhance the enjoyment which he found in wandering to secluded villages, Sunday after Sunday, to proclaim the simple truth as it is in Jesus. His preaching was thoroughly liberal, yet with a Puritan solemnity, appealing to conscience rather than feeling, to judgment more than imagination. Useful as these services were, and worthy of imitation by many who might render such, we believe and trust he will be honoured, as he would desire, for his character rather than for his teaching, and remembered by his daily walk rather than by his Sunday discourse.

J. L. S.

May 7, at his residence, Percy Lodge, Rathmines, near Dublin, JOHN CLASSON, Esq., in the 81st year of his age. Few men have had more ample experience of the vicissitudes of this life, but throughout them all he was the same,—upright, warm-hearted, benevolent; a zealous promoter of every plan which held out the prospect of benefiting his fellow-creatures and raising them in the intellectual, moral and social scale; a sincere, humble and pious Christian. To the simple truths of the gospel, as unfolded in the New Testament, he was attached, not merely from habit, but by intelligent conviction and by his experience of their fitness to regulate, animate and sustain the soul, when such helps are most required. They were his guide through life; under many bereavements they supported him; and in the near prospect of death they not only sustained him, but enabled him to look forward to the approaching change with pleasing anticipation. In principle he was a Unitarian Christian, and never failed to bear his testimony in favour of that much-maligned form of doctrine; but his zeal was unaccompanied by the slightest taint of bigotry towards the members of other churches and sects. His ancestor in the paternal line was one of those who found refuge in these countries from the persecuting measures adopted by Louis XIV., and his hatred of intolerance in all its forms was hereditary. Relying with a firm faith on the inherent mercy of God, he was ever hopeful of the progress of mankind in holiness and happiness through the wisdom and benignity of His providence; this was perhaps the most prominent feature of his personal and religious character. In him the congregation of Strand Street has lost one of its oldest, most respected and most zealous members; his family an affectionate parent and kinsman; and all who were connected with him a generous and sympathizing friend.

May 7, at her residence, Somerset Place, Bath, SOPHIA, widow of Richard DAVENPORT, Esq., of Darwell Bank, Robertsbridge, Sussex, in her 78th year. The death of Mrs. Davenport is deeply felt by the Bath Unitarian congregation, of which she was for many years a truly valued member. She was a sister of Dr. Longley, the Bishop of Durham, who is about to be translated to the Bishopric of York.

May 17, at Ormond House, Old Kent Road, in his 90th year, BENJ. HAWES, Esq.

May 17, aged 19, after three days' illness, CLARA MARIA, third daughter of Timothy KENRICK, Esq., Maple Bank, Edgbaston, Birmingham.

May 18, at his residence, Oaklands, Godley, Cheshire, SAMUEL ASHTON, Esq., in his 56th year.

THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CLXXXVII.] JULY, 1860. [Vol. XVI.

GEORGE HARRIS: A MEMOIR.

Chapter III.

LIVERPOOL AND BOLTON.

While Mr. Harris was engaged in the work of soliciting subscriptions for the erection of the projected Greenock chapel, he was invited to preach at Renshaw-Street chapel, Liverpool. I believe it was through Mr. Belsham's recommendation that this invitation was sent to him. The pulpit of Renshaw-Street chapel had been resigned by the Rev. Robert Lewin at the close of 1816, and Mr. Harris's appearance there was considered to be in the character of a candidate for the vacant situation. He received from the congregation an unanimous request to settle with them as their minister. The letter conveying their wish is dated April 6, 1817, and signed by Mr. Roscoe as chairman of the meeting at which the decision in Mr. Harris's favour was adopted, a number of other signatures being added. On the 22nd of the same month, Mr. Harris signified his acceptance of the appointment, and he entered upon its duties on the 12th of July following. His Greenock friends were disappointed at this change in his plans, but even they became generally convinced of the propriety of the decision to which he had come. When the unformed condition of the Greenock interest is compared with the settled and influential nature of the Liverpool one, that decision seems but natural to the case. That it put off the completion of the work for which he had left Scotland was indeed unfortunate; but this circumstance also proved the precarious character of the enterprize in which he had engaged. It is right, moreover, to say that he did not act upon his own judgment in the case alone. He consulted most of his friends, and both Mr. Belsham and Mr. Aspland approved of the course he pursued.

The situation upon which he thus entered, though an honourable, was a trying one. It was especially honourable to him on account of his youth; but his trial proceeded from what constituted his distinction.

The Rev. Robert Lewin was a notable specimen of that class of Presbyterian ministers who abstained from pledging themselves to any definite theological conclusions. He was understood by

his congregation to be an Arian; but it has been asserted that after he resigned the Renshaw-Street pulpit, he declared his belief in the Deity of Christ. Doctrinal teaching he did not indulge in, and his congregation were in advance of him as to the liberal character of their views of Christianity. Still there were among them some persons who thought with him, and perhaps a greater number who approved of his undemonstrative administration. Mr. Harris was, from the position he occupied no less than by his natural temperament, opposed to the peculiarities of that administration. He had adopted precise doctrinal conclusions, which he was desirous not only of stating without reserve, but of so enforcing as to make them tell upon those who differed from him in opinion. He was bent upon confuting and destroying error, as well as upon declaring what he thought to be truth. It is not strange, therefore, that, from the first, considerable objection to his ministry was felt.

It was only by the commanding position which his oratory immediately enabled him to attain, that the expression of this objection was restrained; but the popularity of his preaching for a time bore down all before it.

Public attention was specially drawn toward him by a sermon he preached on Sunday, April 19, 1818, and which he published under the title of *Unitarianism the only Religion that can become Universal.* It was an uncompromising assault upon orthodoxy. The occasion of its delivery was a pamphlet by the Rev. Robert Philip, an Independent minister, then of Newington chapel, Liverpool, and afterwards of Maberly chapel, London, entitled, *Unitarianism weighed and found wanting, in a Series of Letters addressed to the Rev. George Harris.* These Letters were intended as a reply to a course of evening lectures which Mr. Harris had delivered in Renshaw-Street chapel. To the second edition of the sermon there was appended "A List of the Unitarian Chapels, Fellowship Funds, and other Unitarian Societies in England, Scotland and Wales," which is said to have excited great alarm in the orthodox ranks. The altered sound of the trumpet gave assurance that the aggression was no accident, but was to be the order of the day.

This sermon was followed by *An Address to the Congregation assembled in the Independent Chapel, Great George Street, Liverpool,* which was called forth by a foul imputation cast by an Irish minister, from the pulpit of that chapel, upon a nameless advocate of Unitarianism in Ireland. The correspondence it contains presents an amusing contrast of bluster and reticence on the part of the offender, who declined, with an air of strong moral indignation, to afford the means of substantiating his statements: as thus—"Any further particulars I shall leave you to discover as you can, feeling that I should degrade both myself and the cause I espouse by any further condescension or inter-

course with a man capable of writing such an insulting letter as yours. On this account I request not to be favoured with any more of your epistolary productions. I am, Sir, an enemy of Socinianism, WILLIAM COOPER."—The great painter of human nature has immortalized a similar plea—"What, upon compulsion? No;.... I would not tell you on compulsion. Give you a reason on compulsion!.... I would give no man a reason upon compulsion, I."

Mr. Harris's greatest triumph in Liverpool happened, however, in connection with the delivery of a course of Sunday-evening lectures during the winter of 1819-20. The chapel was crowded night after night with hearers who listened with the deepest attention, and effects were occasionally produced which gave striking testimony to the power of the preacher. Sometimes the congregation seemed to become suddenly breathless, and at other times audible expressions of feeling could not be restrained. It is said that the mere utterance of two or three of the texts occasioned quite an electrical effect; as, for instance, that of the lecture on Free Inquiry, Isaiah xxi. 11, 12: "Watchman, what of the night? Watchman, what of the night? The watchman said, The morning cometh, and also the night: if ye will inquire, inquire ye:" and that of the lecture on Original Sin, Ezekiel xviii. 2: "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge."

Mr. Harris, indeed, was always remarkable for a felicitous choice of texts. I have already quoted that of the first sermon he preached, and it could not have been better chosen by the most practised skill; and that of the sermon on the Rathcormac Massacre—the account of the raising of the son of the widow of Nain—so far decided the case as to leave the way open for an unresisted appeal. Could anything be more apt for his purpose than a text he was accustomed to take when preaching on the comparative practical tendency of Unitarianism and Trinitarianism,—Judges viii. 2: "Is not the gleaning of the grapes of Ephraim better than the vintage of Abiezer?"

The excitement produced throughout the religious community of Liverpool by the delivery of these lectures was very great. Various clergymen of different denominations set themselves to controvert them. The Rev. J. Jones, A.M., of St. Andrew's church, preached and published a sermon on the eternity of future punishment. The Rev. Robert Philip set himself to prove the identity of Unitarians and Deists. Dr. Stewart gave a lecture on the practical importance of the existence and agency of Satan. The Rev. Mr. Breeze took up the doctrine of Imputation; the Rev. Mr. Charrier, the Atonement of Christ proved from the Old Testament; and the Rev. James Lister, the Excellence of the Authorized Version of the Sacred Scriptures defended against the Socinians. In addition to these opponents,

the Rev. James Barr, then of Oldham-Street kirk, addressed to Mr. Harris a letter signed Aliquis, which "procured for its author the degree of Doctor of Divinity from the University of Glasgow. This gentleman was Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, May 1853."* Dr. Thom, in his account of Liverpool Churches and Chapels, tells us that the town walls were for months chalked with allusions to the subjects of the lectures,—"Harris kill the Devil," "No Hell-fire," &c. &c., being thus conspicuously displayed; and a Liverpool minister is reported to have said publicly, though not in Liverpool—"These men deny the doctrine of original sin; they deny the doctrine of election; yea, they deny the doctrine of the Trinity: while such monsters live on the earth, I wonder that the thunder of God sleeps."† Shoals of anonymous letters accompanied the controversy. Of these, several were mere rhapsodies either of praise or of censure; others were solemn warnings or fierce denunciations; and others the expression of gratitude for the free proclamation of scriptural truth: two or three were evidently from insane persons; and one was delivered by the author himself, who attempted to enter Mr. Harris's house through a window with his letter in his hand, and, when discovered, threw the precious missive upon the floor, and hastily escaped as if he feared for the very skin of his teeth.

These lectures were published with notes and an appendix—the latter devoted to their defence against opponents—in an octavo volume under the title of *Unitarianism and Trinitarianism contrasted.* Their publication had been earnestly solicited in an address signed "by persons of almost every religious denomination in Liverpool," and it was under Mr. Belsham's advice and approval that they were sent to the press. The volume had a considerable degree of popularity; and in one instance, the reading of it from a pulpit in the south of England without the accompaniment of manner which had contributed so much to its original effect, riveted the attention of a congregation for twelve successive Sundays. It did not, however, pass without objection from friends as well as foes, nor would any candid person hesitate to acknowledge that there was some ground for objection. The fault of the book was that it dealt too much in disquisitions on subjects which did not lie within the range of the author's personal investigation. In transferring to his pages the results of the labours of others with regard to those subjects, it was not likely that the same degree of accuracy should be observed by him as would have attached to what came within the range of his own knowledge, and thus an exaggerated view was presented of some of the points insisted upon. In what did really come

* Liverpool Churches and Chapels, by the Rev. David Thom, D.D., p. 73.
† Christian Reflector, Vol. III. p. 119.

within his mental grasp, he exhibits a power of treatment for which due honour should be paid to him. His wonted clearness of statement and directness of moral appeal were never more characteristically displayed than they were here, and passages could easily be selected which would justify the commendation with which these efforts of pulpit eloquence were on their delivery greeted. The youthfulness of the man will sufficiently account for the defects of his work; but that work developed qualities, such as the unaffected simplicity of purpose which marked both its matter and its style, to which youth seldom attains. It should also be mentioned that the special fault of this publication was so far corrected afterwards, that the success of his future efforts arose very much from the carefulness with which he confined himself within the circle of his own undoubted knowledge. He became strong by virtue of a self-restraint that led him to content himself with that kind of influence in which his strength really lay.

It could scarcely have happened but that the notoriety which was thus gained for the Unitarian controversy should be distasteful to many sincere adherents of Unitarianism. It broke in upon old methods of action, and jarred against feelings which had been cultivated into a religious habit. It disturbed the quiet of men to whom peace was a necessity of pleasurable worship, and it threw men who identified all virtues with charity into a condition of antagonism. It was as by a sudden wrench that such individuals were torn from their associations, and the pain of separation was increased by its being a boyish hand that forced it upon them. The vigour of the grasp did not by any means compensate for its rudeness, and the earnestness with which it was given was more than balanced by the presumption attributed to it. Many who were opposed to Mr. Harris's proceedings were as sincere and honest in their convictions with regard to the truth held by him as he was; but they believed that theological error was to be corrected by the press rather than the pulpit, and though they would not countenance what they considered wrong, they shrunk from a public exposure of the wrong as fraught with more evil than benefit. There was, indeed, a class of men inferior to these, who acted with them, and with whom they were confounded, and whose special characteristics cannot be altogether omitted. Mr. W. J. Fox thus drew their portrait in a letter to the Monthly Repository:

"I have heard something and seen something of another description of persons called old Unitarians, who deem an avowal of their opinions unwise because it may expose them to inconvenience, and proselyting sinful because the attempt may excite bad passions: who give liberally at Calvinistic collections, and let their own institutions and academies languish or perish for want of support: who can overlook speculative differences such as worshiping an additional God or two, &c., and attend the

services and even the sacraments of the Church in preference to mixing with tradespeople and such folks at a country Unitarian chapel: who object to evening lectures because the smoke of the candles would soil the ceiling of their chapel, or its floor be dirtied by the vulgar feet of the hearers who might be attracted on such occasions: who are vexed that Unitarianism should be spoiled for a refined and genteel religion by its communication to poor and ignorant people, who had better been left to the Church or the Methodists."*

In addition to the religious excitement which Mr. Harris created, he obtained the reputation of a strong political partizan. I have already said that he was, at a very early period, attached to what was called Radicalism. During his student life in Glasgow, he took every opportunity of actively exerting himself in that cause. He was one of the delegates from Scotland to the meeting for Parliamentary Reform which was held in London at the beginning of 1817; and, throughout the whole of his residence in Liverpool, he was prominent in every struggle which had in view the extension of popular liberty. That residence extended over one of the darkest periods of modern English history in its relation to the cause of freedom. The Habeas Corpus Act was suspended during nearly the whole of 1817 and a part of 1818. An atrocious spy system was deliberately adopted and brought into extensive operation. Numerous arrests on political accusations took place, and were followed by imprisonment, transportation and capital punishment. The Manchester massacre occurred in August 1819. The country was for a long time kept in a state of violent agitation, the Government being in collision with the mass of the people, and the sense of civil wrong being aggravated by wide-spread commercial distress. Many Reformers voluntarily left England, in despair of improvement, or were forced to do so by their apprehension of penal consequences. Liverpool was one of the principal ports for this emigration, and Mr. Harris was brought into much personal contact with this class of men, some of whom were professors of his own religious faith. He gave a hearty welcome and his full sympathy to those with whom he thus met on their exodus from oppression, and his hand seconding the generous impulse of his heart, he relieved their pressing wants to his own pecuniary embarrassment. Such a position as was thus assumed was calculated to give increased offence to the parties who were already offended with the new phase of their religious affairs that had presented itself. Perhaps there is no hostility so bitter as that which is felt by persons of conservative feelings toward those whom they accuse of revolutionary designs, and such hostility could hardly be expected to reconcile itself patiently to the relation between members of a church and their minister. In our days, this would produce an unpleasant state of things;

* Monthly Repository, Vol. XII. p. 334.

but, in the days of which I am speaking, the unpleasantness was accompanied with a fear of actual danger from the law. It was excusable that a little irritation should be felt when one's instructor in sacred matters was dubbed—though it was only by Tories—"The Devil's Chaplain;" and one does not wonder that when a sea of white hats—a white hat being the badge of Radicalism—was beheld stretching itself before the doors of the chapel in Moseley Street, Manchester, the frequenters of that temple should have been frightened from their propriety.

Perhaps, however, if Mr. Harris had confined his preaching to his own chapel, neither his religious nor his political activity would have provoked an open resistance. But he engaged in missionary operations that spread his fame throughout Lancashire and Cheshire, and brought him into collision with ministers and laymen in every part of the province which those two counties constitute.

In June 1818, a circular was addressed by him to the Unitarian ministers of these counties, containing a plan of an Unitarian Christian Association, and announcing an intention to submit a resolution in favour of some such plan to the Provincial Meeting to be held in Bolton at the close of that month. The resolution was proposed and apparently received with favour, but no practical measure for carrying it out was adopted either at that meeting or at the subsequent one in 1819.

"The result fully satisfied me," says Mr. Harris, "that if anything were effected for the furtherance of missionary exertions, it must be by a few individuals *beginning* the work, and proving to those who needed such proof, that something *might* be done in the two counties of Lancaster and Chester to disseminate the doctrines of Unitarianism which the ministers in the regular discharge of their duties to their respective congregations had not done. Several persons agreed in these sentiments, and therefore on the 10th September, 1819, at a meeting held in the vestry of the Unitarian chapel, Renshaw Street, Liverpool, it was unanimously resolved, 'That it is a most desirable object to establish an auxiliary institution for the two counties of Lancaster and Chester in support of the Unitarian Fund established in London in the year 1806."*

A general meeting of the Unitarians of the two counties was accordingly held in Liverpool on October 19, 1819, and though there was considerable discussion and some opposition, the plan of action proposed by Mr. Harris was adopted by a large majority. Thus was formed *The Lancashire and Cheshire Unitarian Association.* Attempts were made to obtain for this institution the sanction and co-operation of the Provincial Assembly both at the annual meeting of 1820 and that of 1821, but without

* Christian Reflector, Vol. III. p. 241.

success. It was thus left to its independent resources, and it became, instead of the extensive organization it was intended to be, an instrument principally employed by Mr. Harris and his immediate friends for disseminating their views of Christian truth in those localities which lay within their reach.

A preparation had been made for this work by the commencement of missionary efforts nearer at home. An Unitarian Tract Society, comprising members of both the Liverpool congregations, was in active operation. A Fellowship Fund had also been established. A school-room for Unitarian worship was opened in Cross-Hall Street, Liverpool, various laymen joining with the ministers of the town and neighbourhood in conducting the services. These services were held on continuous week evenings. A class meeting for the purpose of religious reading and conversation was held in the same place with great success, and with it was connected a "Free Library," consisting chiefly of books on the Unitarian controversy. Thus a staff of workers was created and brought into training; and, with their assistance, a great deal was done, as one of the Rules of the Association expresses it, "to promote the principles of Unitarian Christianity by means of popular preaching." Another object of the Association,—"to keep up an intercourse and correspondence between the different religious societies in Lancashire and Cheshire which are united upon the common principles of the strict unity of God, and of his universal love to his creatures,"—could not be fulfilled.

Mr. Harris himself was the mainspring of the movement. At its commencement he undertook a missionary journey for a fortnight through East Lancashire, travelling 220 miles and preaching thirteen times, and attracting large congregations wherever he appeared. This was, in reality, but a fair indication of the course he pursued during his ministry in Bolton as well as in Liverpool. Wherever he had the opportunity of preaching what he regarded to be the gospel of Christ in its purity, he went, regardless of labour or sacrifice or discredit; and everywhere he gathered around him crowds who drank in his word with joy and thanksgiving. Rooms in inns and cottages chiefly formed the temples which he consecrated by the presence of an earnest piety; but not unfrequently that great temple "not made with hands" which earth and sky alone enclose echoed to his living voice.

Eventually the missionary stations under the direction of the Association were Astley, Hoghton Tower, Islam, Leigh, Mellor, Middleton, St. Helens, Swinton and Wigan.

I must pursue the story of this missionary work to the end.

Great dissatisfaction was felt and expressed with the modes of action adopted by Mr. Harris, and many of his ministerial *brethren,* as well as a large and respectable class of the laity,

became alienated in feeling from him. This only rendered him the more strenuous in his endeavours, so that he might, if possible, overcome opposition by success.

When he removed from Liverpool, he took what may be called a missionary situation in Bolton, opening a new chapel in the interest of a body of persons who had separated from the old Bank-Street congregation. Here the field of his exertions was enlarged, and he was especially zealous in upholding and strengthening the cause of those Methodist Unitarians of whom so interesting a history is given by Mr. John Ashworth in his *Account of the Rise and Progress of the Unitarian Doctrine in the Societies at Rochdale, Newchurch in Rossendale, and other Places.* It will be remembered that these people, without knowing of the existence of Unitarianism, arrived, through searching the Scriptures alone, at a belief in the sole Deity of the Father, and the unpurchased redemption revealed by the mission of his Son.

At the Provincial Assembly of 1822, a letter was read from the Rev. John Yates, of Liverpool, offering £100 as the basis of a fund for the promotion of missionary preaching; and it was resolved that an Association for that purpose should be formed. This resolution was carried out by passing by the institution already existing, and constituting a new one. With this new institution Mr. Harris immediately co-operated, its practical working being commenced by his preaching at Middleton under its auspices. The personal opposition manifested in the proceedings which led to the reconstruction of a plan of operation, did not, however, cease when both parties were apparently united in one scheme. "Some ministers and other friends" declined supporting the missionary fund because Mr. Harris was a member of it, and he tendered the resignation of his membership, expressing when he did so "an earnest hope that its exertions might be crowned by the Almighty with success."

An unhappy controversy took place between him and the Rev. B. R. Davis, of Chowbent, which issued in the publication of a pamphlet by each of the controversialists. The strife was still about matters connected with missionary work. I am bound to say that Mr. Harris seems to me to have had the best of the argument; but I have received, even from his warmest adherents at the time, expressions of high regard for Mr. Davis's character; and I am happy in being able to record that, years after, when Mr. Davis died, a warm tribute of respect to his memory was inserted by his old opponent in the pages of the Christian Pioneer.

At the Provincial Meeting of 1823, held at Bury, Mr. Harris preached the sermon, which he afterwards published under the title of *Motives to induce Unitarian Christians to excel their Brethren;* but "the contention was so sharp" between the disagreeing parties, that they dined at two separate inns. The conservative party assembled at "The Eagle and Child,"—the

ensign of the great aristocratic family of the district not insignificantly crowning their proceedings; and the advanced liberals —with still greater significance considering their eager antagonism—took shelter in "The Hare and Hounds."

I need mention but one other circumstance of the same character as those to which I have been lately referring. When, in 1824, a valuable testimonial was presented to the Rev. John Grundy on his leaving Manchester for Liverpool, Mr. Harris delivered a speech at the dinner held on the occasion. To that speech I have already alluded. It produced a great sensation at the time and afterwards. A contrast between the spirit of Orthodoxy and that of Unitarianism formed its most striking part. I have no doubt that, as delivered, its effect was tremendous, though a calm judgment will not approve of its denunciatory character. It excited great wrath and indignation among the orthodox community, and was the occasion of much recrimination. It was resented as an unheard-of thing, although its worst fault was its imitation of similar things on the part of the aggrieved. It gave rise to a correspondence which was afterwards published as a pamphlet, with the title of *The Manchester Socinian Controversy*. To this speech the Lady Hewley suit has been attributed, and it was certainly appealed to as a justification of such proceedings as that suit embraced. I neither accept the justification nor credit the honesty of the appeal. It is a very shortsighted view of the case which does not look beyond that cause. The cause was deeper far than any temporary irritation which a speech could produce, and before the delivery of this speech the deeper motive had exhibited itself in positive acts. I believe, too, that the real offence of the speech was not the accusation it involved, but the determination it indicated. Nevertheless, as this occasion of offence was eagerly seized upon by the enemies, so it was lamented over by many of the friends of Unitarianism, and Mr. Harris was represented as having injured the interest which he was simply bent upon maintaining with an uncompromising vigour. Sad would it have been for the fortunes of religion among those whom he addressed, if the Lady Hewley suit had been staved off by any violation of integrity, though it should be but in the form of concealing the truth.

The circumstances I have related placed Mr. Harris in an unnatural and painful position towards the great objects which he lived to promote. He had lost none of his popularity among the mass of the people; all his energies had increased rather than diminished; but the wide field of activity which he had proposed to occupy was shut against him, or he was deprived of the sympathy and assistance which were necessary to its efficient cultivation. No one throughout the province was to be compared with him in those qualifications which were fitted for doing *the* work of conversion that offered itself, and yet he was not

to take a station with regard to that work in which
had full or free play. The consequence was, that he
in the province only till September 1825. In that
gave up his charge at Bolton, and sought a more open
exertion in Glasgow. There were other considerations
ibuted to this change, but the great reason for it was
xpectations of employment for the missionary zeal that
hin him had been disappointed.
ember 1821, Mr. Harris gave notice of his determina-
sign his office as minister of Renshaw-Street chapel,
, and the resignation took place at the end of the
March. The real causes which led to this separa-
be gathered from what has been already said, but the
of those causes was quickened by personal differences
dered the separation a very distressing one. A change
on this subject has been, however, long ago produced,
se influence all parties would now be ashamed to revert
erable contentions of that time.
sed his ministry with a course of lectures which were
ously attended as any he had previously delivered.
said to have surpassed, as pulpit efforts, the lectures
ited volume, and there were among the hearers of them
proportion than before of intelligent and educated per-
nnected with Unitarianism. The lecture on a compa-
he Churches of England and Rome was introduced by
iking text—Ezekiel xvi. 44, "As is the mother so is
ter"—the reading of which was wonderfully effective.
these lecturing occasions, Mr. Harris, when giving out
ymn, said with marked emphasis, *Let us stand up and*
the congregation at once started to the prescribed atti-
Churchman the next day met a member of the con-
, and laughed at him for allowing his minister, as he
decree rites and ceremonies." "Yes," replied the
rmist, "he is the president of our assembly, and were
me to stand up on one leg, I should do it"—adding,
with true Dissenting reservation—"till I was tired."
nother of the lectures, the gaslights sunk down almost
ss, in the midst of a description of the dimness and
ceding the revival of learning and religion in Europe;
e preacher spoke of the sun of righteousness arising
ing under his wings, the lights suddenly shot up again
ling brilliancy. The singular coincidence was a mere
but if it had been a trick, it could not have been
naged, and many a worse evidence of miracle has been
by the faithful. As it was, the sensation occasioned
: be forgotten by any one who witnessed it.
the last acts of Mr. Harris before leaving Liverpool
pening for Unitarian worship of a place in Sir Tho-

mas's Buildings which had formerly been a Roman Catholic chapel. This was the initiation of a scheme for church extension which, though devised by him, he was obliged to leave in other hands.

Immediately on closing his ministry in Liverpool, he began his ministry in Bolton. The Moor-Lane chapel there, which had been purchased for his use, was opened by him on Easter Sunday, April 7, 1822. The services on that and the succeeding day were conducted in the presence of enthusiastic crowds of people. Mr. Fox, who had engaged to take part in them, being prevented by illness from attending, the whole of the four sermons which had been advertised were preached by Mr. Harris himself. The collections made at the close of these services amounted to £101. 10*s*. 4*d*.

The assembling together of friends from all parts of the district on this occasion was continued at the future commemorative anniversaries, which were regularly held on the Easter Sundays, and became to some extent popular meetings in the interest of the Unitarian faith. "These Easter anniversaries," says one who often partook of their influence, "were glorious gatherings, at which not a few found their principles invigorated, their zeal increased, their resolves to make open and manly avowal of unpopular truth strengthened, and went from the meetings to their several spheres of labour with renewed hope and determination, thanking God and taking courage."

I have no opinion to offer as to the merits of that separation from the Bank-Street congregation, Bolton, which resulted in the formation of the Moor-Lane congregation. The separatists first met for religious worship in an upper room of a cottage where the backs of the people pressed against the slanting roof, and they then worshiped for about five months in the Cloth Hall. The chapel in Moor Lane, which was originally built as a Scotch kirk, but had latterly been used by the Calvinistic Baptists, was taken at a cost of £900, on the understanding that Mr. Harris would occupy the pulpit. What determined him to accept this proposal was, in a great measure, the complete sympathy both on theological and political questions that existed between him and the principal persons who had engaged in the separation. Of these, several had made great exertions on behalf of their principles, and incurred almost total social proscription by professing to be reformers in Church and State. Such individuals as these were especially congenial to Mr. Harris's character, and it was his pride as well as his pleasure to cast in his lot with them.

It cannot be concealed that his congregation, on account of the peculiar circumstances under which it was formed, did not rank, in general estimation, with the other established congregations of the province. The excellent choice of a minister which

the Bank-Street congregation made in the person of the Rev. Franklin Baker worked a sure though gradual strengthening of the rival interest, whose unobtrusive progress contrasted favourably with the continued proclamation of their proceedings which the Moor-Lane congregation found it necessary to adopt. Still, during Mr. Harris's stay in Bolton, everything was done that could, under the circumstances, be done to maintain the cause he had espoused. There was no lack of energy and perseverance on the part of its adherents. In the course of three years, nearly £3000 were raised for the religious objects of the congregation, and this was done principally by labouring men, many of whom worked extra hours in order to gain the means of contributing to these funds. The honest warmth and independence of the Lancashire character was never better displayed than under the circumstances before us. Mr. Harris's talents and exertions were undoubtedly the most important elements in the undertaking to which he had joined himself. He was particularly qualified for the services which such an undertaking required, and that not merely by the actual work he could contribute toward it, but also by the hopeful spirit which he was always able to maintain and ready to encourage. He was a true leader of his enterprizing band; for while prompt to offer the right counsel himself, he was equally quick to perceive and avail himself of the wise suggestions of others.

He left the Moor-Lane congregation in 1825, after a trial of three years, but before the interest had become consolidated, and it could not be expected that the same prosperity should have attended it after his influence had been withdrawn. The two congregations became, in the course of time, united together again, and now constitute, under Mr. Baker's ministry, a happy and prosperous society, to which the memory of the past is as that of a journey through the wilderness which has led to the promised land.

During Mr. Harris's residence in Bolton, besides attending to his regular ministerial duties and the missionary efforts of which I have spoken, he had much controversial work to do. He was, as usual, attacked by a host of opponents, with whom he had to fight single-handed. On the title-page of his pamphlet, *Unitarian Christianity Defended*, which was published at this time, are the names of "the Revds. Abraham Scott, T. Allin and William France, Mr. Richard Carlile, and the Revds. Joseph Fox and William Jones," to all of whom that pamphlet was a reply. Mr. Allin's part of the warfare was very ably conducted. He directed his attack, not against Mr. Harris's theological opinions, but against certain statements of fact which were contained in the volume of Liverpool Lectures. The attack was a successful one, and it was rendered still more so by a rejoinder to the reply. Mr. Harris would, I believe, have had no hesita-

tion in acknowledging that, on this occasion, he fought in armour that he had not proved. The sling and the stones from the brook would not thus have betrayed the confidence of his shepherd's hand. Mr. Allin has been for many years an intimate friend of mine. He is one of the few persons of his class in whom a change of religious opinion on my part has produced no change of feeling or association. It is on this account that I could not forbear from making the reference I have done to this controversy, especially as it gives me the opportunity of adding that, from my equal knowledge of the two disputants, I have been not a little amused on reading their productions by the hard words with which each of them did injustice to himself no less than to his foe.

In 1820, a monthly magazine was started in Liverpool under the name of *The Christian Reflector and Theological Inquirer.* It was devoted to the interests of liberal theology, and its joint editors, as long as the former remained in England, were Mr. Harris and F. B. Wright. After the year 1825, it was continued by Mr. Wright till the close of 1829.

F. B. Wright was in many respects a remarkable man. He was brother of Richard Wright, and also of the John Wright who in 1817 was most shamefully prosecuted for blasphemy. He was a printer by trade, and had himself been imprisoned for unlicensed printing. His theological reading was very extensive, and he had gained a considerable acquaintance with biblical criticism. Besides this, his general knowledge was varied and accurate, and he was more than ordinarily skilful at his trade. He was a busy writer, being the author, among other things, of a "History of Religious Persecutions." He was also a frequent preacher, and one of Mr. Harris's most efficient assistants in that line. He had a determined antipathy to Calvinism, united with a strong attachment to Christianity. With certain oddities of habit, he was nevertheless distinguished for his warm and steady friendships. His wife was a Calvinist; but neither her orthodox persistency nor his Unitarian enthusiasm disturbed the good feeling of his household, though no restraint was placed upon the discussion of religious subjects there on both sides. How he contrived to get through the amount of work he performed was a mystery to his friends; for he seemed always employed in the manual labour of his printing-office, and yet always ready for any other kind of labour that was to be done. If ever there were a single-hearted, faithful and earnest lover of truth, it was he. He was the first to introduce Channing's Sermons and Essays to the English public. They were received, one by one, from the other side of the water; and, appreciating their great value, he printed them separately as they came to hand.

I am obliged reluctantly to content myself with this single sketch of character, selected from a wealth of materials which

relate to Mr. Harris's intimate associates at this period of his life.

A sermon was published by Mr. Harris while in Bolton on *The Causes of Deism and Atheism.* The appeal to unbelievers with which it concludes is among the finest specimens of his power as a preacher that his writings contain. It cannot be read without something of the effect being realized which its delivery must have produced.

My friend, the Rev. Henry Green, of Knutsford, resided with Mr. Harris through a considerable part of the time whose chief events I have attempted to describe. If my description has any interest, it is chiefly owing to the information with which he has furnished me. I have had other aid, but his has been the most valuable. I am only afraid that I have spoiled his narrative by adapting it to my purpose. Besides taking the opportunity to make this just acknowledgment, I have brought forward Mr. Green's name now to give on his authority a brief account of the change which at this time happened in Mr. Harris's domestic condition.

For two years, from 1819 to 1821, except when his sister was with him, the house was a true bachelor's home. A leg of mutton, brought to table from day to day till consumed, was so generally the only dinner provision, that a benevolent lady waylaid the person who took the weekly order to the butcher, and fairly popped the question, "Why on earth do you never have any joint but a leg of mutton?" The fact is worthy of record as it illustrates the remarkable simplicity of taste in the matter of food which belonged to the master of the house. With all this plainness of diet, the utmost hospitality was shewn. The door of the house was always wide open to any one from England, Scotland or Ireland, who was known to have an interest in the Unitarian cause, and the ardent friends of that cause in the neighbourhood might often be found gathered under its roof. To all such the welcome was, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." The bachelor's house, however, underwent a happy transformation in the summer of 1821, when Miss Auchenvole, of Glasgow, became Mrs. Harris. She belonged to a family in Scotland which had long been distinguished for its attachment to liberal Christianity, and her parents took an active interest in the establishment of Unitarian preaching in Glasgow. Her father's house was the resort of University students of Unitarian connections, and in this way Mr. Harris was introduced to the family. Her acquaintance with him commenced on her returning from Birmingham, where she had been at school, to reside with her mother after her father's death in 1813. I am fearful of touching with too rude a hand the sanctities of this married life, but I may be permitted to say in as few words as possible that it embraced thirty-eight years of uninterrupted

confidence. The satisfaction expressed by Mr. Green at the change of administration in the matter of external household comfort which Mrs. Harris's advent occasioned, was but a symbol of the blessing which throughout all those years she conferred upon her husband. Every trial was softened and every triumph heightened to both by the all-pervading influence of a happy home.

In the preceding article, our valued contributor, Mr. Gordon, has referred to a statement made some years ago in Dr. Thom's Historical Account of the Churches and Chapels of Liverpool, to the effect that Mr. Lewin towards the close of his life professed orthodox opinions on the Deity of Christ. We happen to possess a letter from Mr. Thos. Bolton (the first Mayor of Liverpool under its reformed corporation) which, in the judgment of those who knew that gentleman and the relation in which he stood to Mr. Lewin, will probably be regarded as decisive. It will be seen by our readers that we violate no confidence in making this letter public.—Ed. C. R.

Extract from a letter addressed to Rev. R. Brook Aspland, and bearing date Liverpool, June 9, 1855.

"Until this morning I had not seen Dr. Thom's publication. What is there stated of the late Rev. R. Lewin towards the close of his life, as professing 'his belief in the proper Deity of Jesus Christ and that Jesus is God,' I cannot but believe to be very incorrectly reported. I became a member of his congregation in 1800, and continued so until his retirement from the ministry, and neither in his public or social services, or in my intercourse with him during the remainder of his life, did I ever hear from himself or any of his family that he entertained the opinions ascribed to him by Mr. Walter, whom I have always considered deficient in judgment and a very weak and credulous man.

"You will be so good as to make any use you please of this communication.

"Yours very truly,

"Thos. Bolton."

A LIBERAL CHURCHMAN ON THE UNITY OF THE CHURCHES.

Whereby would be produced unity? Would we force on other churches our Anglicanism? Would we have our thirty-nine articles, our creeds, our prayers, our rules and regulations, accepted by every church throughout the world? If that were unity, then in consistency you are bound to demand that in God's world there shall be but one colour instead of the manifold harmony and accordance of which this universe is full; that there should be but one chanted note which we conceive most beautiful. This is not the unity of the Church of God.—F. W. Robertson.

WILD FLOWERS.

These stanzas were written by the late Lady Noel Byron on hearing of Prizes being awarded, at a village Floral Exhibition in Cheshire, to children employed in the cotton-mill of R. Hyde Greg, Esq., for the best collection of wild flowers.

Who loves the wild flower best?
The sailor, who has never seen
For many weeks the living green
Of earth's familiar vest?

Perchance 'tis he who hath
In fever on his bed reclined,
And meets the healing, fragrant wind
And primrose in his path?

Or is he still more glad
Who, issuing from the prison's gloom,
Imagines all the flowers that bloom
In heightened colours clad?

No; there is yet a joy more pure,
Less tinctured with regret or fear,
Where mem'ry mingles not a tear—
Oh! may that joy endure!

'Tis when the fact'ry child
Strives for the kindly-offered prize,
And gathers for the judge's eyes
A garland fresh and wild.

In that sweet garland blend
Our Heavenly Father's smiles of love,
And the best pledge—how dear above!—
That man shall be man's friend!

CHRISTIAN MISSIONS IN INDIA AND THE RELIGIOUS CONDITION OF THE HINDOOS.

THE ADDRESS DELIVERED AT A MEETING OF THE LONDON DISTRICT UNITARIAN SOCIETY, HELD AT RADLEY'S HOTEL, FEBRUARY 24, 1860.

BY MR. HODGSON PRATT.*

I NOW come to a third popular assertion among Unitarians, viz., that the main cause of the small success which has attended the efforts of the missionaries is to be found in the prominence which they have given to theological dogmas from which reason revolts. Now let me first consider how far this is true of missionary preaching addressed to the Anglo-Hindoos or Young Bengal class. When speaking of the educated natives, I cannot help thinking that here at least we have much the same work as that we have at home. In both cases, the opportunity of learning what is the nature of Christ's message is within reach. Theological or philosophical prepossession does not occupy the ground, and I believe thoroughly that neither in England nor in India are theological questions the chief obstacle in the way of progress. Trinitarian and Calvinistic doctrines have not prevented the growth of earnest belief in the hearts of millions in Europe. I doubt, indeed, whether among those having much natural capacity for religious influence—really pious natures—orthodoxy has stood much in the way of Christian belief and nurture at home; nor do I believe that it has been so in Bengal. In talking to the converts, I generally found that they knew very little and thought very little about the theological part of the Christianity they had adopted at such heavy sacrifices. It was the *religious* aspect of Christianity, the personal influence of the missionaries —so much greater and better than any men they had ever known, so different in their motives of conduct, so disinterested, so loving;—it was the grandeur of Christ's teaching, the beauty of his character, so marvellously different from anything they had any idea or notion of—that instinctively told them that this religion was indeed from heaven. Was not this precisely the process in the hearts of the first converts in Judea, Greece and Rome? As to the theology, they took that on trust, for the sake of the rest, neither believing nor understanding it. I believe that with the mass of those who do not embrace Christianity, it is not theology which is the stumbling-block, but their own hearts, the feeble because stifled voice of conscience, the want of a sense of sin, their unwillingness to make the necessary sacrifice or to obey the moral law of the gospel, to give up their freedom, to put themselves under the eye of missionaries and Christian comrades, pride and want of humility of heart. And may I not ask whe-

* Continued from p. 343.

ther, in the case of our home missions, causes of this kind have not more to do with the rejection of Christianity than the theology to which you attribute all the blame? As regards the uneducated classes of the Hindoo population, the missionaries of India have wisely learnt to keep in the background a great part of their systematic theology. They have laid more stress upon the points which Unitarians would themselves put forward, urging of course also upon the people their sinfulness and their need of a Saviour to deliver them from the consequences of their sin, and to help them to grow better.

There is another point upon which Unitarian writers have, in my opinion, laid undue stress, viz., the differences of opinion prevailing among the different Christian sects. But Protestant missionaries in India have wisely agreed to merge their differences, and a thorough union of all denominations, including the Church of England, has been actively and effectively carried out. They avoid interfering with one another. If the London Mission has its agents at work in any town or district, the Church Missionary Society or Baptist Society abstains from going there, and takes some other unoccupied field instead; while every month the missionaries of the different Societies meet together to compare notes and interchange their experiences. As to Catholicism, in Bengal at least, this Church does not come prominently into the notice of the native population; its priests confine themselves chiefly to supplying the spiritual needs of the Portuguese, half-castes and British Catholics. As regards the great mass of Protestant Christians, therefore, it is not true that they are separated into opposing sects, divided by jealousy and by doctrines fundamentally different: in fact, whatever differences exist, they are not appreciated or felt until after a native has joined the Christian community and comes to inquire into details. Nor would these differences, even when known, present any great difficulty to a Hindoo mind. They are accustomed to regard truth as many-sided, and differences of view as the result of divine knowledge coming in contact with the multiplied varieties of human ignorance.

But I am far from saying that the mode in which missionaries have carried on their work among heathen nations is not open to many objections. In the first place, the missionaries, as a body, have not generally possessed the high intellectual capacity requisite for a work of such arduous difficulty. There has been abundant earnestness and self-sacrificing zeal; and I know nothing more touching, more beautiful, than the sufferings of the first missionaries; for it was always those who entered the breach who had to suffer most. There can be no greater proof of the divine power of Christianity than the patience, the long-suffering, the toilsome and arduous labours of Carey, Ward and Marshman in Bengal, or of Judson in Burmah. Picture to your-

selves the lives of such men, passed in the terrible climate of the East, without any of the defences with which men now surround themselves,—dwelling in stifling little native buildings, hardly with the necessaries of existence,—exposed to the depressing influence of fever and malaria, without the society and support of their race and kindred,—working for years in the composition of grammars and dictionaries before they could take a single step forward, —discouraged by the enormous difficulty of making their teaching comprehensible to a race whose whole life, experience and ideas ran in so different a channel from their own,—baffled by the sophistry, ingenuity and learning for which they were utterly unprepared; then after years of effort, perhaps making a single convert who turns out worthless,—a disgrace to their cause,—some one who had imposed upon them for the sake of the money upon which he might indulge his vices! How can we speak too highly of the martyr-like endurance of such men?

Their successors, for the most part, fell into the serious error of neglecting to study the national philosophy and religion, while they were not fitted by natural ability or education for entering into argument with such skilled sophists as the Brahmins. Not only is Hindoo philosophy and theology of marvellous depth and grandeur, containing great truths latent or disguised, but the men trained for their whole lives in its defence are perhaps the most subtle word-fencers and casuists in the world. Perfectly assured of their own power and the unanswerable nature of the Hindoo dogmas, they regard with undisguised contempt the feeble efforts of our unlearned missionaries to argue with them. The missionaries, disheartened with their want of success among this class, addressed themselves to the poor and uneducated, not to those who were "wise in their own conceit." Now, however true it may be that no church can expect to have a permanent or extensive influence which does not bring a gospel to the poor, it does not follow that the first spring of life must always commence from below. And in India, it appears to me, little or no influence can be obtained over the mass of the Hindoos until we have convinced those who spiritually rule over them, the priests and wise men. The Brahmin is regarded as a sacred being, and so long as the people see that the missionaries cannot cope with him in argument, they will not believe that the Christian message is worth listening to. I am now speaking of course of the *masses*, not of the Anglo-Hindoos educated in our schools; for these latter have for the most part quite neglected the study of the national theology. And whatever progress in the direction of Christianity may be made among the latter, it will have no effect upon the millions by whom "Young Bengal" is regarded with disgust. I need hardly point out that the very first condition of success among the learned men of the old school was to understand their real position, to find what ground there might

be in common between us and them, to recognize whatever truths they had attained, and to inquire how these truths have been misapplied or perverted.

Another mistake on the part of the missionary body was, that, generally speaking, they neglected to acquire a thorough knowledge of the sacred and classical language, the Sanscrit. Any man who can speak Sanscrit and quote from the Vedas will command respect. The very fact of a foreigner having mastered what were supposed to be mysteries closed to all but the Brahmins, is a great point gained, and he thus comes before the people armed with the strongest credentials of wisdom and authority. When the missionary is addressing the masses in their own language, he cannot have too profound a knowledge either of the vernacular or of the languages from which that vernacular is derived. If I had time, I could mention numerous instances shewing how the diffusion of Christian knowledge has been impeded by insufficient attention to these things. But our Missionary Societies have now become thoroughly alive to the importance of a higher culture on the part of those who devote themselves to this great work. The labourers selected of late years are men possessing not only zeal and devotion, but distinguished by high intellectual qualifications. Abler men it would be difficult to meet with than Dr. Kay and Dr. Caldwell, of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts; Joseph Mullens, of the London Missionary Society; Dr. Duff, Dr. Mackay and Thomas Smith, of the Free Church of Scotland. The consequence is, that there is an increasing attention to the study of the Hindoo philosophy; and the younger missionaries acknowledge the impolicy of arousing the indignation of the people by indiscriminate and contemptuous attacks upon the national religion and philosophy,—the importance of putting themselves on the same platform with their antagonists so as to know where they agree and where divergence commences. Such works as those recently produced by Dr. Ballantyne* and Rowland Williams† have been of the greatest value in promoting a wiser and juster policy in this respect.

I hope, too, that the missionaries are beginning to feel that those who are engaged in preaching to the masses require a much profounder knowledge of the native languages, ancient as well as modern. No subject requires such a command of language as philosophy and theology. Without a perfect mastery over the terminology of a language, the modes of expression, and the proverbs and phrases, religious teaching can make but little impression. At a later period of Carey's career, he found that he had been talking unintelligible nonsense, when he thought he

* Christianity contrasted with Hindu Philosophy.

† Christianity and Hinduism.

had been preaching very effectively. "Missionary Hindustanee" is a common phrase among the natives, and but few Englishmen ever attain eloquence in the use of the oriental tongues. A similar defect has in several instances seriously impaired our oriental translations of the Scriptures.

I would not, however, be understood absolutely to deny that the theological aspect in which Christianity has been presented has in some degree retarded its progress; but I have endeavoured to shew that too much stress may be laid upon this point. Those who feel this difficulty the most are the sceptical young men of the large towns who have not had a Brahminical training. Their difficulties are naturally very much those of working men of small culture in England, and can only be met in the same way. As regards the Trinity and the Incarnation, these doctrines are closely in accordance with the Hindoo modes of thought, and would be easily understood by the Brahmins of the old school. If Trinitarian philosophers would only take the trouble to understand Hindoo philosophy, they would find much common ground between them. In fact, I may go so far as to say, that a man could hardly have a better training for understanding Trinitarian philosophy than to pass a few years in the schools of Benares. Platonism and Hindooism are one in many respects; and if Trinitarian theories had their origin in the former, the fact I now mention becomes intelligible.

The next point to which I would direct attention is the fact, that our missionaries are *aliens*, necessarily living apart from the people, with habits of life utterly foreign to them. The missionary cannot live on terms of personal and intimate association with the people, or the people with him. He generally occupies a comfortable house, enclosed and rendered difficult of access by his native servants. He keeps, perhaps, a carriage or horses, regarded as a great man's luxuries, which increase the sense of distance. He drinks wine and eats meat, which the population regard as indulgences of a gross and unclean sort. All these things tend to prevent that intimate association with the people so essential to the exercise of a large influence. So long as this is the case, Christianity will be looked upon as an *English religion*, and as unfit for them as black cloth coats and silk hats.

The first missionaries were naturally men who came to India because they had a "call" to the heathen, and braved everything to obey it; but now that English missionaries are supported on comfortable salaries, many come out who merely adopt the life as a profession, or who if in their youth inspired by some higher feeling, lose it under the pressure of worldly concerns, household matters, thoughts of wife and children. But there are many noble exceptions. I could name missionaries who even in these days live as nearly like the natives as is compatible with the preservation of life, in small, unhealthy native houses, with the sim-

plest clothing and food, without a single thing that even a native could think a luxury,—who spend their whole days in the native huts,—who never allow themselves to speak a word of English, so that their tongues may become the more habituated to the use of the vernacular. But we want more of such men. They must be the rule. The masses will not be moved by anything short of the fire of a Paul or a Knox, the self-denial and burning zeal of a Xavier or a Judson.

I have already called your attention to another point, and need only mention it here, because it should come here. So long as the ministers and teachers of the word are exclusively Englishmen, so long will Christianity retain its peculiarly English form. This at once makes it unpopular. A religion to be universally accepted by a nation must assume a form that suits the idiosyncrasy of that nation. It can never produce its full and genuine fruit until cast in a mould adapted to the mental character of the people and corresponding to their past history. Do we not see this in Europe? How different are the forms into which Christianity has there become *crystallized!* (to use the expressive phrase of the Principal of Manchester New College). Could we ever expect to see the form of Christian thought and worship that is best adapted to Scotland, satisfy the spiritual wants of the Italians? Now, Hindoos alone can work out a Hindoo form of Christianity.

I have already alluded to another point, viz., that at least a large proportion of the missionaries should qualify themselves for preaching to the priests and the magnates of India, on the ground that the masses will follow their leaders, and will only become disposed to listen when they see that an impression has been made upon the latter. While the conversion of a man of low degree only adds another pariah to the despised and out-caste horde, making them regard Christianity as a low-caste religion, the adoption of Christianity by a man of rank arrests attention and provokes imitation. In another respect, the conversion of a man of good social position is still more important, viz., that the sacrifice it involves is so much greater, and the greater therefore the elevation of his spirit and heart. The sacrifice re-acts, and produces a higher faith and character than it could do in the case of a poor, obscure man, who rather betters his position than otherwise by the change. As remarked by Dr. Caldwell, the eminent missionary and philologist of Southern India, to propose to a Hindoo of respectability to abandon all the usages of his caste and to embrace a foreign religion, is like asking him to abandon the proprieties of life and to become a pariah; he loses a thousand worldly advantages, while the poor man gains many; but how infinitely more satisfactory the change in the former case, both as regards the man himself and its effect on others! We want more missionaries who are fitted to win over men of this higher class.

I know it will be said in reply to this, that Christianity is a gospel to the poor. That is indeed true; and looking at the fact that all great religious movements in the world have begun from below and worked upwards, I should have been disposed to begin with the humbler classes if I had not seen this mode of reaching the heart of the nation fail.

Supposing it to be allowed that missions to the heathen abroad are as much a duty as missions to the heathen at home, the next question would seem to be, what advantages, if any, *Unitarians* possess for the prosecution of such a work; and what peculiar disadvantages, if any, they labour under. I do not feel qualified to pronounce any decided opinion on this topic. I can only contribute such slight personal experience as I have had in India. The great object of missions being to open the heart of man to the voice of God, to get at the spiritual nature, to awaken it into life amid the stifling surroundings of the world and the flesh, to awaken the conscience to a sense of sin, to render the heart contrite, to make it feel that only in God and His Son is there strength to spring from the slough of lust and pride,—this being the object, have the Unitarians any advantage over other sects? Now, I speak with all deference when I say, that it always appeared to me that the Unitarian missionary in India failed to arouse this sense of sin. Has there not been some complaint of the same kind in reference to Unitarian preaching in England? Mr. Dall's preaching was eloquent, varied and learned; but it never seemed to me such as would rouse the heart to great deeds of self-abnegation, to deep contrition and penitence. Indeed, this is the great difficulty abroad or at home,—this first step to make men feel the sinfulness of their lives. I have occasionally had the opportunity of inducing persons of little or no mental culture, who were living wholly without God, to visit a place of public worship, sometimes a Unitarian chapel, sometimes a church. Wrongly or rightly, I felt when so doing that there was more hope of the change of heart being wrought in the church than in the chapel. This has not been a mere theory on my part, but a deduction from self-experience. Is it not the experience of many here that in the church they have been humbled, alarmed and stricken in heart, while too frequently in the Unitarian chapel they were only interested and gratified?

Now here lies an important question: Is a Unitarian missionary less or more likely to arouse the conscience, to humble and alarm the soul dead in trespasses and sins, whether it be the soul of a rich or poor man? I once asked a native Christian of remarkable independence and ability, who had left Hindooism for Christianity long before Mr. Dall arrived in India, and who subsequently attached himself to the Unitarian mission, what progress he thought Mr. Dall was making among the young men *who met* at his Mission Room for discussion and inquiry. (This

was after Mr. Dall had been among them two or three years.) He at once said that he thought that the effect of his preaching and conversation was not such as to *compel* men to act upon their conviction of the divine origin of Christianity; and that this was just the reverse of what would have been the effect if they had been with the missionaries of other churches. He did not say that the young men visiting and studying with the Trinitarian missionaries would certainly become converts, but that they would have felt so miserable in heart if they did not, that they would either be baptized or leave the missionaries altogether; whereas those with Mr. Dall felt no fear or alarm; that they had the impression that their future salvation was not imperilled by continuing in the position they then held, that of giving a mental assent to the divine origin of Christ's message, while they kept up an outward conformity to Hindooism.

The *Inquirer* says, in the article I have before quoted, "Could we believe that our Heavenly Father would punish those who, having before them the choice of Christianity and Hindooism, honestly preferred the latter?" No; but shall we not tell them of the happiness here and hereafter from which those cut themselves off who, for the sake of the world, outwardly conform to Hindooism, while believing Christianity to be the message of God? Are we to say nothing of the terrible responsibility which hangs over men who, having the message of God offered to them, reject it because it involves sacrifices? With the masses, either here or abroad, who are sunk in sin, we cannot afford to follow the Unitarian dogma that we must not appeal to men's *fears*. I see no warrant, either in the New or the Old Testament, for eliminating all that is terrible in retribution, all the sternness of God's justice and His hatred of sin. Taking human nature in the aggregate, I do not think we can afford to do so: we cannot afford to leave men lazy and contented with themselves. There is another difficulty which lies in the way of a Unitarian missionary, viz., the fact that when the young Bengalees, tolerably well acquainted with the orthodox creeds of Christendom, asked the Unitarian missionary for his creed and articles of belief, he appeared to them to have none. He tells them that some Unitarians believe one thing, some another. I do not mention this as a defect, but as a feature in the Unitarian position which appears to me to interfere practically with their work as missionaries. Even upon such questions as that of the miracles or of the inspiration of Scripture, Mr. Dall, like many others, appeared to me to give an uncertain sound. But directly there was the least suspicion that he was willing to admit an explanation involving the hypothesis that there had been any departure from the ordinary course of nature, the New-Vedantists said they would not have anything to do with him. They said at once that his creed, whatever it was, involved just as superstí-

tious absurdities as that of the other missionaries. So you see that Unitarian theology is placed at almost as great a disadvantage as Trinitarian theology, as it is in England in respect to the Secularists.

If Unitarians, notwithstanding the very divergent tendencies which exist among them, can bring spiritual life to the masses at home, they can do the same work abroad. They may be sure, as remarked in an admirable article in the *Prospective Review* on Judson, that any church must perish that does not occupy the hearts of its disciples with great projects involving great sacrifices. Sacrifices for such objects confer the greatest strength upon a church. The more its members give, the more they will find themselves able to give. And this brings me to the much-discussed question, whether we should or should not spend our means in preaching to the heathen in foreign lands, when we have our own heathen at home. For my own part, I believe that if a man feels called to give of his substance for the purpose of promoting the delivery of God's message to the heathen, or to go himself and deliver that message, no one has any right to question the propriety of his obeying it, and I am sure that he should obey it. I see no reason for doubting that God's Spirit does call men to such undertakings, and that the use of the word "call" is not necessarily a cant term, but expressive of a genuine reality. It seems to me that Christianity is for all mankind, and that we have a duty, as Christians, to make it known far beyond the narrow bounds of our own nation, as we have opportunity. It may be said, too, with some truth, that the masses at home are not altogether shut out from hearing spiritual truth: earnest preachers and missionaries, churches and chapels, surround them on every side. But abroad there are thousands of pious souls who would gladly take advantage of the message, if brought to them intelligibly, and therefrom derive the truest happiness. Are we not to put it within their reach? It is sad to think that hearts all disposed for God's guidance should be grasping painfully after the light for want of some man to shew them the way;—wanting the certain assurance that the voice of conscience speaking within is indeed the voice of God,—the voice of the Supreme, who has actually made Himself known on earth in the directest manner possible. Think for a moment what a blessing we confer upon such souls as are meet for the reception of the message,—what strength in temptation, what consolation in sorrow, what hope of eternal life; the *sure promise of reward* to such as are faithful in right-doing! As for India, the case is especially strong; the people of India are as much the subjects of our Queen as we are. India gives 10,000 of our educated classes a home and means of livelihood; thousands more derive their incomes from India in trade; and I say *that it* would be a very simple and intelligible rule if all who

their means from India by trade or otherwise, should con-
e a per-centage on that income to the support of Indian
ns, just as other men should give a per-centage of their
e towards missions among their own countrymen.
word before I conclude. As to the *modus operandi*, I
e that we shall produce no wide-spread and great effect
we have *native* missionaries in large numbers. They alone
fectually reach the mind of the natives. As a rule, aliens
heir alien tongue, alien modes of thought and habits, can
do the work. We should therefore expend our resources
in training up a native ministry; and I hope the day
ome when no missionary college in England shall be with-
Hindoo students. Is it too much to hope that *Manches-
w College* shall also be represented in the East? It is
nitarians to answer that question. There are many draw-
to their success in this field; and I have preferred to occupy
ttention almost exclusively with the disadvantages of the
rian position, in the hope that you will consider how far
if they really exist, may be overcome. I cannot but con-
o feeling some compunction at disturbing the harmony
at present prevails among the Indian missionaries, by
ng there a Unitarian church, which must certainly lead to
versies and antagonism among Christians which are now
rd of. But if you feel convinced that Unitarianism is
o present aspects of Christian truth inexpressibly valuable
nan beings,—to bring Christianity in a form before some
which would never accept it at all if brought in any other
—you must shew the strength of that conviction by pro-
g to act upon it. Who knows but, in carrying your in-
tation of God's message over the world, you may find races
especially fitted for its reception than even your own
rymen? In any case, as I said before, such a work carries
it its own reward; for it re-acts upon the church that
takes so noble a work, giving it new light and strength,
ing the hearts of its members, deepening their convictions,
rousing them to a greater spiritual vitality.

ROBERT ROBINSON.

Plea for the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ was very favourably
d, and procured the author many compliments from dignitaries
Establishment. Offers were made to him of preferment in the
, which he modestly but firmly rejected. When asked by Dr.
, "Do the Dissenters know the worth of the man?" his answer
'The man knows the worth of the Dissenters."

DEDICATORY ADDRESS TO THE STUDENTS OF THE HOME MISSIONARY BOARD, DELIVERED IN CROSS-STREET CHAPEL, MANCHESTER, JANUARY 25, 1860.

BY REV. R. BROOK ASPLAND, M.A.

My Brothers,—The managers of the Home Missionary Board have asked me to speak for them some words of counsel to you before you go forth to the work for which it has been their aim and effort to fit you. I have thought it a duty to comply with their request, not because I am conscious of possessing any special qualifications for the duty (for the only qualifications I dare claim are sympathy with them and you in your common object and a not short ministerial experience); but I willingly accept this public opportunity of expressing my cordial approbation of missionary labour, and my increasing interest and hopefulness in regard to the Institution which has helped you to prepare and gird yourselves for the work of the Christian ministry. I deliberately use the words *Christian ministry*, although the destination of some of your number, whether it be for the pulpit or for the mission-house, is, I know, as yet uncertain; for the humblest domestic missionary, if he be faithful to his calling, is, I feel, as much entitled to my brotherly regard as the most able minister of the New Testament, possessing the rare endowments of a prophet. I know not whether the excellent and gifted men who have preceded me in the performance of this duty have founded their counsels of dedication on any particular text of Scripture; but there can be no inconvenience in my making in this pastoral address special use of those words spoken by our Lord Jesus Christ, that Great Shepherd of the sheep, and recorded in the Gospel of St. John, x. 11, *The Good Shepherd giveth his life for the sheep.* As used in their original application to the Chief Shepherd, the words were prophetic of the martyrdom of the cross, meekly endured for the instruction and the salvation of the flock. Happily, it is our privilege to live in times which deprive the words of their literal significance when applied to the Christian teacher. But it is impossible to suppress the thought that from the days of Stephen downwards to those of Latimer and Bradford, Servetus and Biddle,* there have been men who, in the spirit of their Master, have laid down their lives for the gospel. And if, through any unexpected vicissitude, the evil days of persecution should return, I doubt not men equally brave and true would be found in our own church, as well as others, who would dare to die for their religion. In the lower

* Though not put to death at the stake, this brave and learned man actually was a martyr to the truth. Unable to pay the heavy fine inflicted upon him, he remained in his noisome jail, and contracted a disease which, though he was in the strength of his age, being in the forty-seventh year of his life, terminated it September 22, 1662.

and figurative sense in which the words may be applied to the religious teacher whose lines have fallen within the pleasant places of civilization and religious liberty, there is sufficient significance to justify the application. The earnest Christian minister will be prepared to devote all the energies of his life to his work, and will with a cheerful zeal sacrifice many personal tastes, nail to the cross of his Master many natural desires, in order that he may prove himself a *good shepherd*. He will at least wish and strive to make his own life a model of the Christian character, and thus in a moral sense *give his life for the sheep*.

Oh! my brothers, I cannot but commend the honourable ambition, that of Christian and pastoral usefulness, which burns in your hearts. You have adopted a noble calling. I presume that you have deliberately *counted the cost*, and are prepared to pay it in lives of self-denying toil. Your past history so far is a pledge of your future zeal. The work now before you was not a parent's choice for you; it was your mature individual selection. You have reached the door which opens to you the hopes of professional usefulness, not by traversing a pleasant field of lettered ease, but have had to overcome some difficulties, bear many privations, and to ply the labouring oar through successive double tides of your student life. The discipline of these years of studious toil will benefit you through life. I speak now not so much of the stores of knowledge you have collected, as of the habits of study and thought you have formed. You know by happy experience what persevering industry may enable you to do. No longer under the guidance of able and accomplished teachers, you will have to depend henceforth mainly upon yourselves for carrying on the work of self-improvement. I do not fear that you will do discredit to the intellectual and moral opportunities you have recently enjoyed, by imagining that the work of education is closed, that there is no need of collecting further treasures, and that you can safely live upon your present intellectual capital. If you desire to be a Christian *workman that needeth not to be ashamed*, you must give continued *attendance to reading;* you must habitually meditate on the things becoming to the scholar and the Christian, and give yourselves earnestly to them. Make immediate and systematic provision for continued habits of mental culture. Let a portion of every day be set apart sacredly to the studies that become your calling. You will presently find active duties coming in upon you with an increasing tide, and, unless you have secured a means of safe retreat, will be presently overwhelmed. Even with the best arrangements and a firm resolution on this subject, you will find it difficult to keep out at stated times the world, with its thousand claims upon your notice.

You have reached, my brothers, a crisis in your lives. Realize

to yourselves its importance. What you are to be, what amount of service you are to render to the church and the world, depends on *yourselves.* Lay out your plans thoughtfully, wisely. Remember you are drawing out a scheme for life, for eternity. Set clearly before your mind what you profess and what you know that you ought to be. You are going forth to apply the knowledge and principles which have formed the staple of years of study. You are entering the great field of the gospel as missionary labourers. An apostle has told us that it is a true saying, that *if a man desire the office of a bishop* (a spiritual overseer, pastor and teacher), *he desireth a good work.* But it is a laborious and a very responsible work. You undertake a very solemn trust, no less than the defence, diffusion and illustration in your life of *the glorious gospel of the blessed God.* You must strive to be not only able scholars, but true ministers of the New Testament. You go forth to *preach not yourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord.* You are the advocates of no mere party; you are not the disciples of any school of philosophy; but you are the servants of Christ, him whom the Father ordained to be the great Teacher and Saviour of man. For eighteen centuries the gospel has been struggling to overcome by its pure and benignant light the spiritual darkness of the world. But the world is still in darkness. You may, if you will, become burning and shining lights. But, in order to this, the light of the gospel must first shine in your own hearts. It must be reflected on them *from the face of Jesus Christ,* and then it *will give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God.* I am far from desiring to hamper you with any narrow and technical definition of preaching Christ. They have studied the gospel to little purpose who have not learned how free, liberal and fearless its spirit is. Because I wish you to be able ministers of the New Testament,—because, above all things, I desire that you may be good ministers of Jesus Christ, nourished by the words of faith and of good doctrine, I exhort you *to stand fast in the liberty* which is your Christian birthright. Accept from no man a creed as a substitute for God's word. But, on the other hand, having after due examination accepted Christ as the author and guide of your faith, be true to your profession. Let your cherished thoughts and your habitual teaching be subordinate to and consistent with the clear facts and the admitted doctrines of the gospel. Have no Master save Jesus Christ. And take care that Jesus Christ is the Master in his own house. Much of the success of your future ministry will, I believe, depend on your fidelity to the gospel of your Master. If you preach a full and fearless Christianity, intelligible to your own understanding, accepted without reserve or stint by your own heart, and, above all, a Christianity which it is your daily effort to reduce to practice in your own *godly* walk, be assured it will convince other minds, satisfy other

hearts and regulate other lives. With a true, earnest and hearty faith, there is great power of sympathy in the minds of the mass of men. But to a timid, hesitating, half-yielding and half-resisting faith, men will give little heed. Never, for the sake of popular effect, be so disloyal to truth as to preach that which you do not both clearly understand and cordially believe. For a time you may, and probably will, have difficulties on many subjects. On them it is not expedient that you should profess to teach other men. But let not doubts and difficulties on matters of small importance trouble you. If on any of the cardinal articles of Christian faith difficulties and doubts, once subdued, revive, then summon all your energies to meet them. Weigh the question in all its bearings; seek from every quarter the required evidence; and to the stillness of your own soul pronounce your verdict; and unless new evidence arise, let your decision be final. Do not let mental conflicts of this kind distress you. They are in the early stages of the ministry common to all ingenuous minds. You will in the end be the stronger and better soldier of Christ for having to fight *the good fight of faith*, resisting and dispersing enemies from within as well as from without.

Let your conception and preaching of Christianity be clear and comprehensive. Go to the gospel for great principles, and when you have found them, commit yourselves unreservedly to them. Abide not in the mere letter of the word which killeth, but rise fearlessly to the spirit which giveth life. Be thoughtful and wise in the selection of the topics on which you seek to teach the people. Give no heed to fables and mystical dreams and metaphysical riddles. These things engender strife plenteously, but tend in no respect to godliness. The present age is largely characterized by its increased taste for the metaphysics of religion.

> "Here each mind
> Of finer mould, acute and delicate,
> In its high progress to eternal truth,
> Rests for a space in fairy bowers entranced."

The same admirable poet* has uttered an emphatic warning against too great an addiction to such mystic visions:

> "Scruples here
> With filmy net, most like the autumnal webs
> Of floating gossamer, arrest the foot
> Of generous enterprize; and palsy hope,
> And fair ambition, with the chilling touch
> Of sickly hesitation and blank fear."

If many disciples have loved to enter on this phantom ground, it is most remarkable how the Great Master on all occasions

* Mrs. Barbauld. See the Lines addressed to Coleridge (1797), Works, I. 209—211.

avoided it. He never assumed "the garb of deep philosophy," but dwelt on simple truth and practical godliness. Learning from him a lesson of intellectual forbearance, we may well counsel the young minister of religion,

> "*Not here,*
> Not in the maze of metaphysic lore,
> *Build thou thy place of resting!* Lightly tread
> The dangerous ground, on noble aims intent."

As an illustration of what I mean when I counsel you to avoid in popular address subtle speculative questions, let me specify one on which much has been written and spoken, on which if some men have uttered fine and noble sentiments, others have indulged practically mischievous speculations. The nature of the church of the future and the duties we owe to it, have to some minds proved topics so alluring, that, giving way to fears lest the strong and honest convictions of one age should restrict the freedom and obstruct the road to truth in the age to follow, they have looked with a cold and jealous eye on earnest convictions of every kind, and counselled a cautious reticence on all the great topics of man's faith and hope, differing in every attribute from the fearless energy of truth-uttering prophets and apostles, and of the great and good men who have helped on the progress of the world. Every age has its own difficulties and dangers enough and to spare, and it is a morbid anxiety that would import into it those of a coming age. If the men of each age will do their duty, seeking truth in a loving spirit, and when found proclaiming it with a modest yet fearless utterance, it is enough. Progress is certain. God, to whom alone the dark future is visible, will take care of his church in the age to come, and give to our children and our children's children the means of overcoming our errors, just as He has enabled us to master (as we think) some of the errors of our fathers. It is a wretched distrust of his providence and of the omnipotence of truth, to fear that they who are to succeed us will love the truth less, or be less successful than ourselves in their efforts to reach it.

While I would deprecate the frequent introduction into your addresses to the people of abstract and difficult trains of thought, let me not for a moment be supposed to give countenance to flimsy and frivolous discourses, in words which do not represent solid thoughts, and give neither light to the understanding nor warmth to the heart of him that hears them. The preacher who respects himself or his office will not dare to offer to man, still less to God, that which *costs him nothing.*

Take all reasonable pains to ensure the profiting of your hearers. Vain to them is the preacher's wisdom and eloquence if they do not understand him. St. Paul describes a prophet, indeed, as one that *edifieth the church*, while he that speaketh *in an unknown* tongue *edifieth only himself.* Of some modern

speakers in an unknown tongue it may indeed be doubted whether there is always the solitary result of self-edification. Remember, O my brothers! you put yourselves forward as leaders of the people. Be true to them that trust in you. Be also considerate and patient and condescending to the intellectual and spiritual wants of the poor and unlettered. They perhaps trust entirely to your leadership and commands. The battle of life is to them a long and dangerous and trying struggle, *and if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?*

I am pleased to think, my brothers, that you have during your years of study diligently practised the art of communicating instruction, and that especially you have endeavoured to make yourselves *apt in teaching* the young. You cannot have a more promising and fertile field in which to sow broadcast the seed of truth. Remember how affectionately the Great Shepherd enjoined on his disciples to *feed the lambs* as well as the *sheep* of his flock. Nowhere will you find so profitable an investment of knowledge and skill in teaching as in the young of the flock. They will open their innocent hearts and ingenuous minds to those instructions which come fresh and warm from the honest and good heart of a faithful and a kind teacher. Through the children the pastor sometimes finds that he can best secure the attention and reach the hearts of their parents. That which interests the mind and improves the character of his children, a parent feels must be good and true; thus, in the touching interchange of mediatorial offices which is, under God's providence, so manifest a part of the discipline of life, *out of the mouth of babes* in Christ *He ordaineth strength.* Thus from the vestry-class and the mission-room the well-taught child becomes a missionary, carrying knowledge and grace to those whom wiser and more eloquent instructors would have in vain essayed to win.

You are about to give yourselves to the duties of the pastor's life. If you desire to be good shepherds and to diffuse religious influences and pastoral consolations to the flock, there are two things required. First of all, you must carry to your work the principle of *Christian love.* Whether you seek to instruct the ignorant, to reform the wicked or to console the sorrowful, let those to whom you speak as a pastor feel and know that you address them with hearty and honest sympathy. Never let your words or manner beget in them the suspicion that you are only practising on them in the exercise of a mere professional skill. If in your intercourse with them they feel that you are simply analyzing their motives and characters for the gratification of your own metaphysical skill, or by the study of the errors of their conduct or the weaknesses of their hearts that you only desire to increase your knowledge of morbid spiritual anatomy,—in such cases your opportunity of pastoral usefulness is destroyed.

They will not give you their hearts. Why, indeed, should they open that sanctuary for the intrusion of a selfish curiosity? But if they feel themselves addressed by pure Christian love, by honest Christian sympathy,—if in their sorrows they see that your hearts vibrate with theirs, if in their weaknesses and sins you speak to them with the wisdom and the compassion of one of like infirmities, needing as they do a compassionate Saviour and a God of mercy,—then you will not speak in vain. Every hour of such spiritual intercourse between a pastor and the members of his flock increases his opportunities and their confidence in him. But sympathy alone will not do all that is required. You must with your love to the flock combine habitual, deep, trusting, loving faith in God. Wanting this, you will be in the midst of life's trials and woes weak and unstable. Lacking strength yourselves, you cannot guide the wandering and support the weak. Oh! my brothers, let me enjoin it upon you to look with jealous watchfulness to your own hearts. Take with you to your work the assurance that it is right in the sight of God, that there is the needed well-spring of piety. If religious trust and hope be not fast in your own heart, you cannot carry them to the hearts of others. If there be not unquestionable piety in the heart of the pastor, there will soon be manifest languid circulation in his pastoral influences; and at no very distant day there will be the coldness of spiritual death. Nourish, then, for your own sake and the sake of your flock, your souls with prayer and devout meditation, and all those habits of thought and feeling which will fill them with vital piety.

Remember, in laying out your plans of usefulness and all the intercourses of social life, to maintain the supremacy of your religious bearing. Let men always know that your light and strength come not from man, but from God. This is to be done not by loud and vehement profession; but there must radiate from you, as there did from the face of Moses after he had been on the Mount, the unmistakeable effulgence of true godliness. Be content with the quiet, natural dignity which belongs in society to a minister of religion. Pride and pretension are in every man offensive, but in none more than in the minister of religion. Care nothing for the affectations of professional separation, the mere man-millinery of clerical life. Where such occupy the thoughts, it is indeed a sign of a weak or an ill-furnished mind. In apportioning your time and strength to plans of public usefulness, let due proportion be observed. Give yourself mainly to them which belong to your calling. You do not by giving yourselves to ministerial life cease to be a citizen. There are some duties of the citizen and the patriot to which the minister of religion can fittingly and profitably devote himself. Only take heed not to allow your habits to become prevailingly secular. This will be to sacrifice the higher to the lower calling.

There is one topic which I have purposely delayed to the close of my address. It relates to the position which you will hereafter occupy in relation to other Christian churches.

You will disappoint the natural expectations of your friends of the Home Missionary Board if you are not habitually catholic in sentiment and practice. You will fail to appreciate the instructions and the examples of which you have been privileged to partake, if as Christian labourers you are not ready to do good as far as in you lies to all and with all. Vindicate by such a course of Christian action your place in the catholic church of Christ. Your right to it may be now and then questioned by the petulance of bigotry; but you will take it and keep it in spite of all gainsayers, and with the consent of most good men. But you go forth as UNITARIAN missionaries. You profess to teach Christianity in its simple purity,—to prove its adaptation to the understanding of man and to the natural affections of an honest and good heart. Appreciate the duties and the honourableness of the Unitarian position. Its honour consists not in its denial of what other men believe, but in its being that form of doctrine which best fits Christianity for the intelligence of the cultivated understanding and the appreciation of the pure and kind heart which God has made natural to man. Your duty is to preach the gospel alone, unmixed with the leaven of human creeds and philosophy falsely so called. The only mysteries you are to propose are those of the kingdom of heaven; and these, following in the steps of the Great Teacher, you are to shew are mysteries no longer, but are revealed for man's acceptance and belief.

You may be earnest in your Unitarianism without a tinge of bigotry. You can only teach Christianity if you understand and as you understand it. If a careful and dispassionate study of the Bible, and especially of the New Testament, has disclosed to you that there is but one God, the Father, that he is the God and Father of Jesus Christ, and that it is his gracious will that all men shall be everlastingly saved,—that repentance and reformation are the road which opens heaven to the conscious sinner, —that the blessings of the new covenant may be obtained by all who give their heart in obedience and love to God, through Christ their Saviour,—if such be the lessons which you have learnt from the gospel, then go forth as faithful missionaries of the Cross and proclaim the word of blessing and hope with all your mind and all your strength. Stop not by the way to listen to the denunciations of bigotry on the one hand, nor to the doubts and fears of an earth-born philosophy on the other. You have a higher mission than philosophy ever gave to its disciples, in whatever mysteries they may have been versed. You are disciples of the Son of God, and your mission is to proclaim a religion suitable to man and glorious to God,—a religion which, once understood

and honestly obeyed, would give new grace and dignity to life, the calmest peace and hope in the hour of death, and unspeakable blessedness through the countless ages of eternity.

A writer on "Logic in Theology," of some repute in his own branch of the Christian church, has indeed said, that "viewed on every side, secular, professional and spiritual, the lot of an English Unitarian minister is at this time pre-eminently undesirable. He stands in a false position, and is devoting life, intelligence, acquirements, and many estimable and serviceable qualities, to the hopeless task of upholding a scheme of religious doctrine which makes no way."

There are multitudes of worldly men who would assent to this opinion, so far as the secular lot of the Unitarian minister is concerned. On this part of the subject,—although I know that some particulars need to be put to the other side of the account before a perfectly true balance can be struck,—I care not to say one word to tempt you or any man into the Unitarian ministry by the prospect of temporal reward or repute. Let the position of the Unitarian minister be all that Mr. Isaac Taylor has said, as far as this world goes, and yet to him who enters upon it conscientiously, believing that what he undertakes to teach is a long-lost truth—in short, that he has *the pearl of great price* of which the Master of Christians loved to speak—then his lot is eminently desirable and noble. He is Christ's true servant, and is entitling himself, through opposition, ill repute, obloquy, penury, to the highest rewards which the religion of the Cross has in store for them that are faithful. It is not necessary that the Unitarian minister, any more than it was necessary to him whose servant he is, should be *successful;* but it is necessary that he should be conscientious, earnest and bold in saying what he believes to be truth, whatever amount of evil men may say against him falsely for Christ's sake. It is strange indeed that one who has studied in the school of Christ should not have learnt the first lesson of self-denial, and the necessity to the true disciple to take up his cross. I hope that you, my brothers in Christ, are prepared for all that may befal you; that you know your duty, and will go on to its performance in a spirit of patient and trustful fidelity to him who is your only Master.

And now, thanking you for your patient and respectful attention, I must say Farewell, and dismiss you to your several posts of toil and danger. Soldiers of the Cross, you have put on your armour, and have vowed allegiance to Christian Truth. The field of battle is before you. Go forth to the conflict in the spirit of your Heavenly Leader; endure hardness as soldiers of Christ; take the shield of Faith, the helmet of Salvation, the sword of the Spirit; and may God give you strength and the victory! Amen.

SCRIPTURAL HYMNS. By SIR JOHN BOWRING.

No. XVI.

"Jesus saith unto her, Thy brother shall rise again" (John xi. 23).

THAT Christ who o'er his Lazarus wept,
And said, "The dead again shall rise,"
Is "the first fruits of them that slept,"
Their Head, their Herald to the skies.

Not to this wretched life alone
Our hopes are bounded. Christ hath given
To those he loves, a nobler zone,
And calls them to a higher heaven.

But earth's anxieties and cares,
And prayer and praise and deeds of love,
Are but the lowly ladder-stairs
By which we reach that heaven above.

'Tis here life's history begins,
Where day and night's vicissitude,
And suffering's discipline and sins,
And weal and woe combine for good.

For God and Goodness are the same;
On all their rays benignant fall;
LOVE is the ever-during name,
Embracing and pervading all.

No. XVII.

Hast thou not known? hast thou not heard, that the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary?" (Is. xl. 28).

"HAVE ye not seen, have ye not heard,
And hath it not been told you
From the beginning," that the Lord
Will strengthen, will uphold you,
If, struggling through life's weary race,
You keep His law and seek His face.

Yes! ye have heard and ye have seen
The Wise, the Great, the Holy,
Will ever be what He hath been,
The refuge of the lowly,
Who from the depths of prayer's recess
Seek strength from His almightiness.

Was it not told you from the first,
He faints not, tires not ever;
He still is merciful as erst:
His glory waneth never.
We pine in pain and pass away;
He knows nor darkness nor decay

CRITICAL NOTICES.

An Introduction to the Evidences of Christianity. By a Fellow of the Royal Society. London—printed by J. E. Adlard. 1859.

By those who attach more importance to an argument in behalf of religion from a layman than to the same argument from a professional "defender of the faith," any work like the present will be welcomed and highly approved. At the same time it must be acknowledged that Dr. Beard's "Letters to a Young Man" pursue the same kind of argument as that adopted by "a Fellow of the Royal Society," and conducts it with equal skill and with more learning.

An argument, however, ought to be judged on its merits, and not according to its advocates; though, if any preference is due, it is to those whose life and study it has been to set forth the evidences of religion. It is well when some zealous, deep-read country magistrate ventures to add notes and commentaries, "with vagrant and poaching experience," to Burn's Complete Justice, or when a hypochondriacal sufferer from indigestion publishes his experiments and results to enlighten Galen, Celsus and Gregory; but still we are inclined to think "Coke upon Lyttleton" or "Stephens upon Blackstone" safer legal guides,—and Sir Henry Holland and Sir Benjamin Brodie quite as trustworthy practitioners and advisers. Why the evidences of Christianity are different from those of Law and Medicine, we never could make out; but so it is supposed to be. We are in raptures when a Lord Brougham writes notes on Paley's Natural Theology, or when an Earl of Rosse lends the lustre of his title to adorn the evidences for a Saviour's truth; but let a Lardner or a Neander, a Bishop Butler or an Archbishop Whately, step forth as champions of revelation, and the cry is raised, These are men trained for that very purpose; they have been taught thrust and parry, and all the points of offence and defence; and you surely will not be so unfair to the puny and trembling infidel as to put them in the front of the battle! Gently, my good Sir!—a light, skirmishing volunteer, whether Ex-chancellor or Fellow of the Royal Society, may have very good metal in him, and come on with a will and a resolution for the fight; but commend me and my defence to the veteran soldier, who from his youth has been familiar with his weapons, and has learned neither to run a tilt against a stone wall, nor to fear any open attack, from whatever quarter it may come.

Nevertheless, inasmuch as reason belongs to all men, and its discipline and training in one branch of science or of knowledge prepares it to enter with advantages on other branches, we are bound to receive with respect the labours of any well-taught mind, though it should leave its accustomed walk and enter on a new field of culture. So it is with the Evidences of Christianity by a Fellow of the Royal Society;—though not the special calling of a member of that noble institute, revealed religion concerns him as it does all men, and his powers, hitherto devoted with no slight reputation to other subjects, are prepared by habits of reflection and reasoning to treat well and judiciously the testimonies of Christianity. In the same way as Newton, by his wonderful application of the understanding to explain the mysteries of stellar worlds, won for himself a right to be listened to on any subject to which he

might devote his mind, so does the Fellow of the Royal Society, who comes, from other pursuits where he has gained distinction, to the study of revealed religion, acquire a claim on our attention.

And this attention in his case is well deserved; for the line of argument which he takes is one which enlightened minds will love to follow; and the manner in which he conducts it is attractive, if not new, and displays varied reading and a sound appreciation of the nature of Evidence.

The argument alluded to is constructed on the hypothesis that, if no Christian records existed of the great advent and holy ministry of the world's Redeemer, and that if all our knowledge of divine revelation had to be derived from the scattered notices of heathen historians or anti-christian philosophers,—on this theory he maintains, and we think with success, that the main features of Christianity would be plainly traceable, and that from them we could construct a nobler religion than any which had been known to exist, and that this nobler religion would also bear the unmistakeable impress of divine power and wisdom.

For ourselves, we regard it as more philosophical and more reasonable, of course under proper restrictions and with a just balancing of the evidence, to trust rather to the testimony of a religious Teacher himself, and to that of his intimate companions and disciples, than to such hearsay, prejudiced, and, on this subject, thoroughly uninquiring writers as Suetonius and Tacitus, Celsus and Porphyry. With the name of philosophical historians on subjects generally, on the Christian religion they are the most arrant retailers of common rumours and vulgar bigotries. A Thomas, persistent in unbelief until demonstration was given,—a Peter, rebuking his Master because that Master cast down the dreams of a selfish ambition,—and a Paul, who was an honest persecutor of the faith which afterwards he defended,—these my philosophy and my common sense tell me are far superior to any witnesses in the whole circle of Greek or Roman literature;—they possess intimate knowledge and are not swayed by prejudices in favour of the cause for which they perilled life and worldly fame. I accept, then, their testimony, with all its imperfections, supposing them to exist, in preference to any classic authors; for the classics may guide me in the proper use of words, but not of necessity in the weighing of arguments and evidences.

But to the author's work itself. The argument is clearly stated that there must of necessity be miracles in creation, or the following out of a law which had not previously existed, and therefore that miracles in themselves are not improbable. "There is no evidence," he contends, p. 16, "which leads to the belief that a single species of plant or animal could have been, by natural process, developed, in any conceivable length of time, into another species. All scientific experiment and research tend to shew that the commencement of each must have been miraculous."

In the midst, however, of this argument, we find the expression, "the inspired writers." The words are out of place; in such an argument as our author's, *inspiration* is a thing not to be assumed; it may be true to the fullest extent; but the truth has to be evolved, not taken for granted; it is a conclusion to be arrived at, but must not enter the steps of the demonstration.

Some other expressions also are objectionable; as, "a member of the Hebrew race named Jesus Christ," p. 21. Jesus was the name, Christ

the title: the one is often interchanged for the other; or the two may stand together, as in the Liturgy of our English Church; but to express with accuracy the idea of the apostles and of the apostolic church, we ought to say, Jesus *the* Christ. It would be just as correct to say, "Jesus Shepherd," "Jesus Redeemer," "Jesus true Vine." Christ, Shepherd, Redeemer, true Vine, are terms of office, not family names, and the article *the* Christ, *the* Shepherd, &c., should point out the distinction.

Speaking of the destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 70, he says, p. 34, "We have unquestionable proof the new creed had spread over a considerable portion of the ancient world at least sixteen years before that event." *Sixteen* should be *six*, if, as shewn, p. 27, the time at which Tacitus fixes there were many Christians at Rome before the year of Christ, 64.

A Fellow of the Royal Society is much too confident when he asserts, "Papias had no doubt been misinformed respecting the language in which St. Matthew's Gospel was originally written, although a similar statement is made by Irenæus, the mistake perhaps having arisen from a translation of it into Hebrew having been made by some of the Judaizing Christians." Some of the most eminent critics, as Cave, Michaelis and Mill, maintain that the original language of St. Matthew's Gospel was Hebrew; and Dr. S. T. Bloomfield asserts (*Greek Test.*, Vol. I. p. 1), "It is not too much to say that the existence of a Hebrew original was held by the Fathers almost unanimously; but Whitby, Benson and Hales suppose two originals,—one Hebrew, the other Greek,—both written by St. Matthew."

At p. 47, he says, "Clement expressly quotes the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, a fact of importance, as it is scarcely possible the latter could have been written before the Gospels." The First Epistle to the Corinthians was written A.D. 56 or 57; for the Gospels, Lardner gives the date between 63 and 68; Dr. Bloomfield inclines to A.D. 37 or 38 for St. Matthew's Gospel, to A.D. 67 for St. Mark's, to A.D. 66 for St. Luke's, and opposes the idea of a late date for St. John's: our author, therefore, in the passage quoted uses too strong language. It is not simply possible, but probable, that the First to the Corinthians preceded three out of the four Gospels.

The remarks on miracles, p. 57, might be excepted against, and yet the conclusion, pp. 59, 60, be deserving of much attention, that a perfect belief in "the great majority of the miracles recorded in the Gospels must be left in some measure to individual faith."

The passage quoted from Tacitus, p. 67, has no reference given; it is to the History, v. 13. It is a negligence in the author not to quote the particular work, nor to add the chapter and verse.

It weakens an argument to press into the service any doubtful authority; our author does this, p. 70, in the case of the notice supposed to have been given by Josephus respecting our Lord, and receives the notice as genuine; but a very subtle critic, De Quincey, in his "Classic Records reviewed or deciphered," p. 254, remarks with extreme decisiveness,—"True it is that an interpolated passage found in all the printed editions of Josephus makes him take a special and a respectful notice of Jesus Christ. But this passage has long been given up as a forgery by all men not lunatic."

i, we are told, "The Saviour himself had expressed his con-
mere external ceremonies:" the expression "contempt" is
for the facts. The Saviour placed external ceremonies at
value; but it was no expression of contempt which directed
" to shew himself to the priest as a testimony to them."
at p. 74, there occurs the inadvertency of speaking of "the
and the Jews during the life of Jesus." We read of our
thren, of his disciples and apostles, but "during his life" his
re never spoken of as Christians.
hings,—blemishes and inaccuracies,—we mention, not to dis-
work, but because they are essential to a just criticism. The
yle, illustrations and arguments, all deserve approbation; and
t, or rather topic, is of great importance to be borne in mind,
Christian religion be true, and if the events recorded in the
ally did take place, we should possess the same evidence on
t which is now accessible" (p. 67). Resting on this fact,
r most unreasonable to demand more evidence than what is
table to the case in question. The testimony given is from the
of unimpeachable veracity, possessing full opportunities, and
ompetent to judge and discriminate. His companions in
who knew him and saw him, assure me that Captain Massey
st to plant our colours in the Redan at Sebastopol; am I to
hem because there is no mention of the fact in the account of
of Solferino? And yet something of this kind is expected by
attempt to throw discredit on the evidences for the Christ of
ie truth of God. Hold the balance fair, and dread not the

Theodore Parker: a Discourse delivered in South-Place Chapel,
, on Sunday Morning, June 3, 1860. By Henry N. Barnett.
p. 16.

E PARKER was a brave and honest man, a scholar and a man
a lover of free thought and speech, and one who, if needed,
e gone serenely to the stake for any of the great principles
new to be true. But his faults were great. Sometimes he
rrogant—and most arrogant when furthest from the truth.
ng on what he thought was superstition, he was sometimes
uncharitable to men as sincere as himself; and his bitter
n portions of Holy Writ are at times unreasonable as well as

Dissenting entirely from his opinions on the nature and
f revelation, Unitarian Christians have had no difficulty in
justice to and admiring his genius and his moral worth. They
een not slow to admit that there was in him a rich vein of
arnestness; that while he uttered many harsh and scornful
ecting theologians and their beliefs, and Christianity and its
he held with a firm grasp many of the essential principles of
ry of the New Testament. In reference to the trying ques-
very, Theodore Parker shewed throughout life a soundness of
nderness of heart, and a brave truthfulness, which do honour
nature. Where some men, with whose opinions on other
subjects we habitually agree, have trimmed and proved false,
rm and fearless. Honour be to his memory!

We know not what will be the tone in which the Unitarians of America will speak of Theodore Parker; but we know well enough that the Unitarians of England have individually been forward to pay homage to his memory. From both the platform and the pulpit, earnest tributes of respect and admiration (more or less qualified by the recollection of what is due to Christian truth) have been offered to his learning, his genius and his uprightness.

Mr. Barnett in this discourse says some true things with pleasing unction; and although no judicious friend of Theodore Parker could think the discourse quite equal to the subject and the occasion, it might, with the aid of the author's apology of its not being prepared for a wider publication than that which the South-Place pulpit gives, have passed muster with better productions of the same kind. But there is one passage so singular, so incorrect in the facts referred to, so arrogant and offensive to a body of men with whom Mr. Barnett has, we suppose, but a slight acquaintance, that we cannot pass it over in silence.

For a purpose, Mr. Barnett assumes that the alienation of the Unitarians of England from a former minister of South Place, now a Member of Parliament and a political writer of no mean repute, arose from causes similar to those which alienated the Unitarians of America from Theodore Parker. That alienation of the English Unitarians had nothing whatever to do with the opinions of the gentleman referred to. However, Mr. Barnett founds on this imaginary resemblance between the two men an attack on Unitarians, who, he says, "spurned, maligned and denounced" both, because they "marched on beyond the prescribed boundaries of their denomination." He then proceeds rhetorically to ask who they are who are "guilty in this nineteenth century of behaviour so unseemly and so mean?" In reply, he draws this amiable portrait of English Unitarians:

"It is an outcast sect; a sect who, for its own heresies, cannot boast the recognition of any one of the acknowledged churches of Christendom. But are you surprised at this? I am not. Thank God, I have reached my present elevation without passing through the Arctic Regions of Unitarianism!—the most incongruous, effeminate, and pedantic, of all the little sects that ever struggled for place and power on this sect-ridden earth. Who are these Unitarians that go simpering through society, holding their hands up in horror at this doctrine, and shaking their heads nervously at that heresy? Who *are* these vaunted friends of 'universal toleration,' and 'civil and religious liberty all over the world'? Where do they congregate? What grand achievements have they wrought?* Where shall we go to catch the echoes of their grand songs, or the traces of their missionary enthusiasm? I cannot find them. In Boston, Theodore Parker had a congregation twice as large as all their churches in London put together. They have some dull-looking chapels; but where are their congregations? Mr. Fox is a respected and not uninfluential member of Parliament. South-Place Chapel, in spite of the leaven of spiritual immobility you have inherited from them, and in spite of all the mischief they have attempted to inflict upon you, is still open and comparatively flourishing. But where are these Unitarians? They are dying out. They know they are dying out. It is right that they should die out. They never had any robust health; they were sickly in infancy, delicate in youth, feeble in manhood; their whole life has been a peevish consumption. Go into a Uni-

* [One achievement of the Unitarians, it might be answered, was in their simplicity to build the chapel in which now they and their opinions are denounced.]

tarian chapel, hear the singing, listen to the prayers, listen to the sermon,—all cold, cold, cold! No joy dwells there. They are held together by a name which has nothing in it but a paltry sectarian significance, and a profane assumption of the analysis of Deity. They beat out their thin little creed Sunday after Sunday, till even their own disciples grow tired of the process. They are afflicted with respectability as with a disease. Gentility has become a sort of chronic rheumatism among them. They will tell you they never burnt any body to death; no, they never had fire enough among them to singe a sinner; how, then, can they be expected to consume the saints? So refined and elegant have they become they cannot pray, they can only present ceremonial addresses to the Almighty; they cannot preach, they can only elaborate, in artificial chasteness, the small theology which has been handed down to them. Remorse, faith, devotion, are all too masculine for their capacity,—these are rude impulses, not suited to their tastes. They are dying out, not because they have no truth on their side, but because they have buried truth beneath a load of inhuman proprieties. They would not die out if they had the ardours, the simplicities, the glow, the warmth, the sunshine, the zest, of the spiritual life. The best of them admit and deplore this. It is not their creed that is killing them, it is their lack of religion. For religion, let me tell you, is no puny, simpering, lackadaisical, delicate thing; it is hearty, robust, genial, generous; it has throbbing impulses and heroic resolves; it makes adventurous experiments, and maintains an easy self-reliance. It gets its manners, not from fashion-books and guides to etiquette, but from the mighty inspirations of God and the warm instincts of humanity. It revels in its privileges; wears its obligations as a glorious yoke; marches along its path of duty with a firm and stately tread; fights its foes with right lusty vehemence; embraces its friends in a right fervent fellowship; scatters its benefactions with a bountiful hand; consoles its sorrowing children with a most chivalric tenderness; and is, in short, a noble, stalwart, free, magnanimous, and heroic spirit. Gentility any where is a nuisance; in the church it is a fatal incongruity. The Unitarians do not persecute; but they are skilled in all the fine arts of the cold shoulder; and I can really feel more patience with the harsh curses of old Rome than I find it possible to preserve when religious intolerance puts on the manners of social prudery, and when the hollow and hypocritical securities of the drawing-room are imported into the sanctuary of God."

We do not doubt that our readers will derive amusement, as we have done, from this elegant specimen of denunciation. It reminds one by its smack and tone of harangues put by some of our writers of fiction into the mouth of an excited orator, the mouthpiece of a parish vestry or the hero of a bar-parlour. While we decline to accept Mr. Barnett as an authority in matters of congregational history antecedently to himself, we respect his authority when he speaks of matters that relate to his personal history. There are some auto-biographical hints in the passage which we shall not fail to remember. Forewarned, we shall not venture to claim for the Unitarian church the merit of having been the means of educating Mr. Barnett's refined taste and exact sense of Christian charity! We know from the best source of information that he has not reached his "*present elevation*" through a Unitarian portal. Nay, the happy consciousness that he has not passed through those "Arctic Regions" of faith, extorts from him the cry of "Thank God!" Mr. Barnett's piety is as manifest here as his charity; and when he returns thanks for not being as other men, those sorry publicans, the Unitarians must feel the rebuke, and learn practically how ungenial is the "cold shoulder" of which Mr. Barnett speaks. How far his spi-

ritual lineage is purely orthodox, without any taint of heresy, we of course are not the persons to give an opinion. One characteristic of "orthodoxy" he assuredly has,—spiritual pride,—a readiness to test the truth of a system by the number of its articles and of its adherents, —and the fancy that he is qualified to read his brother's heart and pronounce it irreligious. How full may be our author's creed or his chapel we have no means of knowing; but when we read his denunciation of the Unitarian name as "a paltry sectarian significance" and "a profane assumption of the analysis of Deity,"—when he describes our creed as thin and little, and ourselves as dying out from a lack of religion,— we might suppose him a disciple of M'Gowan, or a would-be rival of Spurgeon.

The combination in our author of the theology of Theodore Parker with the scornful airs of orthodoxy high and dry, is amusing, and shews how not even scepticism itself can drive out from the heart presumption and intolerance. But in the eyes of the minister of South-Place chapel, Unitarians have worse faults than their small creed and their irreligious hearts. They are afflicted with the disease of "*respectability.*" They have a sort of chronic rheumatism—"gentility." They are social prudes, and import the hollow and hypocritical securities of the drawing-room into the sanctuary of God.—Against the charge of "respectability" and "gentility," what can the hapless Unitarians plead? Mr. Barnett is of the opinion of one John Holland: "Well, I say it was never merry England since gentlemen came up." Unitarians will, when he presides over the Star-chamber, share the fate of the poor Clerk of Chatham: "Away with them—hang them, with their respectability about their necks!" And the cry of this spiritual Jack Cade will be,

"Follow me—'tis for liberty.
We will not leave one gentleman!"

We remember a time when this H. N. Barnett talked in another style of Unitarians. We could, by turning back to the pages of our Magazine some eight years, shew how once upon a time he, in the goodly town of Evesham, volunteered his presence and eloquence in an assembly of Unitarians; how with them he talked of "religious liberty," and so far from feeling himself in the Arctic Regions, grew warm in enthusiasm, and volunteered a second speech in praise of the character and faith of the Unitarian minister of the town; but we suspect our readers will not care to know more about the opinions or deeds of the minister of South Place, Finsbury.

John Milton's Last Thoughts on the Trinity. A New Edition. London—Whitfield. Pp. 82.

It is well that the public should always have the means, at a moderate cost, of satisfying its curiosity respecting the last thoughts on religion of John Milton. We therefore thank Mr. Whitfield for this cheap and neat edition of this remarkable portion of the "Treatise on Christian Doctrine."

INTELLIGENCE.

WEST-RIDING UNITARIAN TRACT AND MISSION SOCIETY.

The forty-fifth anniversary (the tenth of the mission) was held at Bradford on Wednesday, June 13th. There was a religious service at Chapel-Lane chapel, at half-past eleven o'clock. There was a large congregation of ministers and people from every part of the Riding. The service was introduced by Rev. G. V. Smith, B. A., of York, and the sermon was preached by Rev. Andrew Creery, B. A., of Stockport, lately curate in the diocese of Rochester. The text was Matt. xiii. 33—"Another parable spake he unto them, The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven, which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened." The sermon opened with the assertion of the vitality of Truth, followed by a striking picture of St. Paul's conflict with imperial Rome as illustration. The process of change of opinion in the individual mind was then very truthfully sketched,—the doubt, the loosening of old convictions, the advent of new, the falling away eventually of the old. The recent volume of "Essays and Reviews" was next quoted as containing the opinions of representative men in the Established Church—Temple, Jowett, Rowland Williams, Baden Powell* and others—freely canvassing the subjects of inspiration, prophecy, the creeds, even miracle itself. Now these men were engaged in the instruction of the youth of England in our great schools and universities: what will be their effect on the next generation? We must regard them as *unsettlers*, but we may rest assured that the result in the future will be the pure and simple religion of Jesus Christ. There were signs of new life in the churches; people grew heart-sick of nonsense; they wanted the plain, simple truth. What, then, was our duty? We must have a positive religion, a definite faith, a disciplined church. Sceptics were calling out, not for less faith, but for more,—for a genuine religion. The Unitarian church was the only one that could accomplish the change. While the Catholics had Peter and the Protestants Paul, we had Christ only. The poor always heard us. Our great mission was to gather up those who were drifting away. Providence had raised us up to do this work, and to animate and redeem our country.

Such is a brief outline of a most interesting and beautiful discourse, rendered more so by the simplicity and earnestness of one who spoke from a genuine experience.

Before the congregation left the chapel, a Petition, praying the House of Commons not to pass the Census Bill so far as relates to "religious profession," was unanimously adopted and numerously signed.

The company then repaired to Saint George's Hall, at the other end of the street, in the elegant and convenient saloon of which a cold collation was laid out at half-past one. Ninety-seven ladies and gentlemen sat down to partake of it, and by three o'clock, when admission was free, the number was nearly doubled, so that the room presented a very animated and crowded appearance.

On the motion of Rev. J. H. Ryland, seconded by Rev. R. L. Carpenter, THOS. TODD, Esq., of Dewsbury, a most important helper of the new Unitarian interest in that town, was called to the chair. The first sentiment was, "Long life and health to Her gracious Majesty the Queen."

JOSEPH CLIFF, Esq., of Wortley, near Leeds, was then called upon to propose a vote of thanks to Mr. Smith and Mr. Creery. The sentiment ran thus: "That the best thanks of the meeting be presented to the Rev. G. V. Smith, for conducting the devotional services of the morning, and also to Rev. A. Creery, B.A., for his able and impressive discourse; and that the meeting desires to testify its earnest and respectful sympathy with those who, like Mr. Creery, had left a Church to which their affections had clung, and to which worldly honour and privileges might attract them, in obedience to the voice of conscience, and as followers of Him who came to bear witness to the truth."—Mr. Cliff said he was delighted to have the opportunity of proposing it; his own sympathies, as one who had gone through a similar change, though not from the Established Church, so entirely going along with it. What we needed was the earnest following out and faithful outspeaking of what we feel within to be the truth of God. There was too much unfaithfulness to truth; yet he was quite sure there was no other way for truth to advance but by each individual being faithful to the truth he held: he felt deeply, therefore, with such as were so. No one but such as had

* Intelligence of Professor Powell's death had been received in Bradford just before service.

gone through a similar experience could understand the peace of those who get the first glimpse of light.

Rev. G. Barmby, of Wakefield, seconded the resolution. What he had liked in Mr. Creery's sermon was its hopefulness, its sympathy with those who doubt or provisionally disbelieve. We were religious beings, and it was a sad thing to doubt: doubt he regarded but as leading to a coming era of higher faith. To the words "able and impressive" as characterizing the sermon, he would add the word "appropriate;" and he had greatly admired its beauty and animation.

Both Mr. Cliff and Mr. Barmby spoke with sympathy in the devotional services of Mr. Smith.

Mr. Creery spoke in reply as follows: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, I thank you for the hearty reception you have given me on this my first visit to Yorkshire, and for the kind feelings of sympathy you have offered me. It is pleasant to come among earnest people, especially those who love truth and desire to spread it. It used to be said of Unitarians that they were a cold church, that they liked their religion very well for themselves, but did not care for any one else to like it. When I was in the Church, it was frequently said among us, "The Unitarians are the best of all Dissenters, for they are never active to propagate their faith; but as for the Methodists, Independents and Baptists, they are continually bothering us, and opening meeting-houses in every parish." But we mistake them. They do not wish to proselytize; nor should they; but they desire that their opinions should spread. If a man thinks his opinions right and wholesome, we should not meddle with him. His opinions probably are the best for *him*. We should rather seek those that are lost in scepticism. I believe by confining ourselves to this, and preaching the plain and simple religion of Jesus Christ, we shall best accomplish the mission Providence has fitted us for, and gain the respect of thinking men in all sections of the community. Of those men who hold my views and remain in the Church, I have not a word to say; to their own Master they stand or fall. Let each be true to the light that is in him. They have a work to do, and are doing it, and God speed them, so long as they are conscientious! In our own church, I am convinced we may have great hope for the future, certain as we are that all things will work together for good to those who love God. I again thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for your hearty reception and kind feelings.

Mr. Smith acknowledged his part of the resolution. The scene before him recalled a similar one of many years ago, the annual meeting of the Tract Society in Bradford, at which he was himself ordained; and it gave him the opportunity of looking back through a period of nineteen years and of tracing changes and improvements. The contrast was considerable; the assembly was incomparably larger; although he missed several honoured friends, some of whom were gone, others were no longer in the district, and others were disabled by infirmity. Among them he would mention their stanch and generous friends of Royds Hall, and the late Mr. Hollings. Among those present to-day he scarcely recognized a face. Still there were great signs of progress; and they had every reason to take courage: those whom they lost would be replaced by others as faithful. One reflection must strike us. If the difference of the last twenty years be so great, what will be the improvements which our successors twenty years hence shall be able to trace! Mr. Smith sat down, explaining the non-attendance of friends from York, some of them being officially engaged on a great occasion of their own city.

The Chairman then called on the Secretary to read the Committee's report.

Rev. R. L. Carpenter read an excellent report accordingly. It gave the usual account of books and tracts distributed, to the amount this year of £45; it recommended a revision of the Catalogue and the appointment of Mr. H. Wellbeloved as successor in the office of Book Secretary to Mr. Francis Oates, now pursuing his studies at University College. It spoke of the efficiency of the missionaries, Mr. Haigh and Mr. Dixon. Donations, collections and increased subscriptions from Bradford, Leeds and Wakefield, had met the increased need of funds consequent on the appointment of the second missionary, Mr. Dixon; but an enlarged scale of subscriptions would in future be more generally required.

Accounts of the several stations followed. Of Pudsey, where Mr. Haigh resides, and where so good has been the progress that a chapel is about to be erected, twenty-five subscribers to the Mission having already contributed upwards of £400 to it, and the Pudsey people having purchased the site with their own contributions, amounting to £160.—Of Dewsbury, where there is now a well-fitted place of worship and good school-room (thanks to Mr. Todd); where Mr. Jackson, of Leeds, contributed the painting, and offers the same to Pudsey and as many more chapels as can be

erected; where Mr. Dixon resides and the congregation flourishes.—Of Clayton West, near Huddersfield, where an excellent Village Library is forming, and there is a good congregation, in the best sense influential; at which there are attendants from some miles round, and for the fostering care of which the Mission is greatly indebted to Mr. James Robinson, resident on the spot.—Of Flockton, near Wakefield, which has been supplied lately by the Mission.—Of Idle, where supplies have been sent in consequence of Mr. M'Combe's state of health.—Of Pepper Hill, near Halifax, where ours is the first denomination that has gained a footing in the place; where there is a library of 450 vols.; where there was an attendance of 400 at Sunday-school sermons, with a collection of £6; the scene of Mr. Stradling's efficient labours.—The report concluded with thanks to the several gratuitous labourers; with redoubled requests for effort and means; and a reasonable appeal for unusual exertion at a time and on the spot of unusual activity among the assailants of Christianity.

G. Buckton, Esq., then read the Treasurer's account. It shewed that with one missionary the receipts had been £156. 17*s.* 9*d.*; with a second, £267. 11*s.* 6*d.* Some special efforts had met this rise. More would be required.

Rev. John Kenrick, M.A., then moved, "That the reports now read be approved and printed for circulation as usual, and that the friends of the Society be urged to use all their efforts to provide for the needful expenditure of the coming year." Mr. Kenrick remarked upon the Tract Society having become a most important adjunct to the Mission, upon the operations of which he looked with great pleasure. He thought the prospect now was far more encouraging than formerly. It was evident there were several stations in which a great deal of good was done, and the foundations of permanent societies were being formed. Among others, Pudsey was being constituted into a permanent form, and it was a most encouraging circumstance that the people there had done so much for themselves. While we praised Idle and Dewsbury very justly, and their liberal helpers on the spot, we should not forget that Pudsey had none such, and that the people there must have made many sacrifices to subscribe so fully as the published list shewed. That list was a sufficient proof of a wide basis which would make the building secure. The desirableness of the permanence and extension of our views in this part of the country was sufficiently evident from the general opinion of all those who had any acquaintance with the operative classes of the West Riding. Christianity must not only be a leaven of bread, as was eloquently shewn in the sermon of the morning; it must be an antidote to poison, the poison of scepticism which was the great bane of society, both high and low. That of the higher classes, there could be no doubt, would be met by able men. We wanted men to go among the working classes, to meet their honest difficulties, and present to them religion under a form that recommends itself to their plain understandings and honest, uncorrupted feelings. And our missionaries are doing such a work. I therefore entirely agree, Mr. Kenrick continued, that it will be a great dishonour if we allow any of their exertions to fail for want of support. I agree with the sentiment also that calls for lay preachers. Though I have been an educator of preachers myself, I think that laymen may do essentially the same work as the minister. And as for the part of the resolution which relates to pecuniary support, I think it is impossible for any one to travel through the West Riding and not see the great increase of wealth. When we look not only at the palatial warehouses of Leeds and Bradford, but at the dwellings of the middle and working classes, it is impossible to suppose we shall allow any work to fall through for want of means. Great corporations set up their motto, *Fumum et opes*, "Smoke and wealth:" the increase of smoke is palpable to all of us; and if it be a measure of the increase of wealth, there must surely be abundance for every good work.

Mr. Mark Glover, of Bradford, seconded the resolution.

Mr. W. P. England, of Huddersfield, moved "The thanks of the meeting to the officers of the past year, together with the appointment of Committee and other officers for the year ensuing; also of a Committee for the re-modelling of the Catalogue of books and tracts."

Rev. Thomas Hincks seconded the resolution. He said we had heard in Mr. Creery's sermon of the loosening of men's belief and of the amount of scepticism that prevailed, and that it was our office to meet it. If so, we must be careful to present Christianity in a positive, earnest, devout and spiritual form. Let working men know this—that the form of faith we profess is not merely negative of errors, not the least possible belief, but that we hold positive religious principles leading to a devotional life. What, then, was the function of Unitarianism? Not to boast of superior enlightenment or make loud profession of freedom from popular preju-

dice, but to go among the masses with the religion of Jesus Christ. It is said our religion will meet the case of the working men; they want a believable form of faith. A remarkable example of this may be found in Pepper Hill, alluded to in the report as a place where we have been the first to gather the people in, and it affords great ground of hope. We have only to cease from complaint and heartily do the work before us. Our sentiments are pervading all sects: we should rejoice at this, and not be too ready to censure those who do not come out and join us. A strong, vital, spiritual religion was especially required also to counteract the materializing influences of society. It was acknowledged that the tendency of modern civilization was adverse to the spiritual life. We had a great work to do—all of us—in various ways, and may well take to heart the weighty truth, "To him that knoweth to do good and doeth it not, to him it is sin."

Rev. B. Herford proposed, "That this meeting feels that the time has now come for establishing the mission church at Pudsey on a permanent basis by the erection of a suitable chapel and school-room; that the appeals already published for donations to this object be heartily sanctioned, and the Committee authorized to take whatever steps they may deem advisable towards immediately proceeding with the building." Mr. Herford spoke with great earnestness and zeal, and admiration of the Pudsey movement. He thought that the work we had to do could not be done by merely two missionaries, but that our work was that of missionarizing the whole of the West Riding—that we must not say we cannot do more. He was extremely glad that Pudsey had come out as it had done, and felt convinced that it must soon become self-supporting. He hoped there would soon be other applications for chapels, and that application for funds would not be made out of the West Riding itself.

H. Briggs, Esq., of Wakefield, said, after the stirring, persuasive and energetic speech which the meeting had just listened to, it was unnecessary for him to say one word. He cordially agreed with the resolution, which he begged leave to second.

Mr. Harrison, of Leeds, proposed—"That the missionaries, Messrs. Haigh and Dixon, possess our sympathy in the work in which they have been zealously and faithfully engaged; and that whilst rendering our cordial thanks to the laymen who during the past year have rendered such valuable and disinterested aid to the mission, we hope that they will abound yet *more in the* good work, and find fellow-labourers earnest in diffusing and exemplifying the truth as it is in Jesus." He said, first, in reference to the preacher of the morning, it was a glorious sight to see a man throwing off the associations of a Church to which he was attached, and speaking out what he believed to be the truth. All honour to all such men! [We are sorry we cannot profess to give even a notion of the very hearty and racy speech with which Mr. Harrison followed up this remark.]

Rev. R. L. Carpenter seconded the vote, and was followed by Rev. R. L. Haigh and Rev. J. M. Dixon, who briefly acknowledged.

Joseph Lupton, Esq., of Leeds, next proposed—"Honour to the memory of those who during the past year have ceased from their labours in our churches: the Rev. Benjamin Carpenter, for many years the beloved pastor of our church at Nottingham; the Rev. George Harris, the eloquent and unwearied defender of Unitarianism in the North; the Rev. Dr. Hutton, whose name, honoured throughout our churches, was peculiarly dear in this district, where a long period of his ministry was passed; with others, Rev. J. C. Smith, of Thorne, and Rev. W. Clack, of Soham, who in less conspicuous services have laboured faithfully and well; and not less honour to one who, though not of us, is held in reverence by all in every church who love the spirit more than the form of religion,—to the brave and good Theodore Parker, whose memory is for ever associated with the noble struggle for human freedom." He said, first, he was glad to see and hear the preacher of the day and other friends from Ireland. It reminded him of that day seven years ago, when the late Mr. Armstrong, of Bristol, who had similarly left the Church, was preacher on the occasion, also in Bradford. Mr. Lupton feelingly spoke of all the ministers named in the resolution, especially observing how delighted the late Dr. Hutton, whom they had all so much loved and admired, would have been to see the large and animated meeting; and of Theodore Parker he would say, that if it was the right thing to be a Christian in character, *he* was one; he would have laid down his life for the freedom of the slave, and it might truly be said that in him not only the slave but the whole world had lost a friend.

Rev. John Owen seconded the resolution, especially dwelling on his knowledge of Mr. Harris in his latter years, and according with Mr. Lupton's testimony to their other departed friends.

Rev. J. H. Ryland said, as the sentiment just received related to those who

were gone, what he had to propose referred to those who were to take their places. He must just say of the former, in reference to the expression used of Theodore Parker, "not of us," he believed that in the best results of Christianity he was not only with us, but far outdid very many of us. His difference of opinion from us seemed to be in not deeming Christianity so special a thing in human experience as we most of us thought it. Even of this difference, he feared, the way in which some of us had treated him, had been a chief cause. He had now to propose, "That this meeting cordially welcomes the Rev. W. Matthews, of Huddersfield, and the Rev. William Blazeby, of Rotherham, who have settled in the Riding during the past year; and is glad to receive assurances from Selby and Rotherham that the congregations there desire to unite with this Society." And to this he was permitted to add, "A friendly welcome to visitors from other parts." In these he should include especially Rev. Lindsey Taplin, of Todmorden, whose romantic valley had lately become rife with the Unitarian controversy, in consequence of the visits of an itinerant lecturer with whom he had himself had some skirmishing in Bradford, —and the Rev. Robt. Spears, of Stockton-on-Tees, editor of the favourite periodical, the *Christian Freeman*, whom he was particularly glad to see at their meeting. That work had exactly met the wants of the Mission. A few years ago they were saying at committee, some work of the kind must be produced, when it spontaneously arose from the North in the hands of Mr. Spears. He must be permitted to add his testimony to the sermon and the preacher. Sincerity and faithfulness to truth he regarded as the very essence and theory of Christianity. As to what had been said of pecuniary resources, he was quite sure no religious communion would support worthy schemes more liberally than ours.

Mr. G. Buckton seconded, and Revds. W. Matthews and W. Blazeby briefly acknowledged the resolution.

Rev. Robert Spears, of Stockton-on-Tees, proposed, "That the cordial thanks of this meeting be given to the minister and congregation of Chapel-Lane chapel, Bradford, for the trouble they have so kindly taken in preparing for our welcome." After expressing his pleasure in having accepted a pressing invitation to attend the meeting, he said such meetings ought to put an end to the complaint that we were not in a sound and healthy state, that we were a mere rope of sand. We met in a free and generous spirit, without the least suspicion of one another: the pleasure and animation of the meeting confuted the allegation that Unitarianism was the frigid zone of Christianity. Meetings like this formed a most happy connection between different parts of the country, and had the most salutary effects on our social nature. Mr. Spears related how he was led to take up the *Christian Freeman*, and, on a question from the audience, said it was now taken by 250 congregations, and that he printed 4000 copies monthly. Village organizations and the poor, he thought, were infusing a new and genuine life into our churches.

Mr. Stott, of Halifax, seconded the resolution.

Rev. J. H. Ryland in acknowledgment said they were glad at Bradford to take their turn in receiving the meeting. The absence of some friends had already been referred to by Mr. Smith. He was sorry to regret the absence of others, as members of the Kell and Pesel family, and their liberal friend and supporter, Mr. Thomas Hollings, all abroad. He had been glad to see so large an attendance—especially, as was to be expected, the new and gratifying feature of friends and members of the Mission churches springing up around them. He had received letters from the ministers of Selby and Doncaster, detained at home by necessary occupation, but who hoped to join us in future years. Other friends had also expressed strong desires to come. He hoped what had been provided had sufficiently sustained the company in speaking and hearing what it had been subjected to; and though the reception of the meeting had been the occasion of some anxiety and care, yet responsibilities were fast dropping off, as he sat down heartily thanking all for their attention.

Mr. Osborne, of Sheffield, then proposed a vote of thanks to the Chairman, and sympathy with his generous exertions at Dewsbury. Rev. L. Taplin seconded it. And on its being supported by Rev. P. Cannon, of Wakefield, Mr. Todd acknowledged the compliment; and the party separated soon after six o'clock.

There were also present among the company, J. H. Oates, Esq., and C. Wellbeloved, Esq., of Leeds; W. Hornblower, Esq., of Huddersfield; Mr. Hicks, of Northampton; Jonathan Crowther, Esq., late of Halifax; James Kitson, Jun., Esq., Grosvenor Talbot, Esq., and Rev. E. Hall, of Leeds; R. Pesel, Esq., of Bradford; R. Edlestone, Esq., Mr. A. Wadsworth and Mr. Stradling, of Halifax; and Rev. A. M'Combe, of Idle; with several of the Bradford congregation, as well as many from Pudsey, Idle, and other places in the vicinity.

The meeting appears to have been felt by all to have been unusually interesting and successful. It affords another proof (the London meetings at Whitsuntide being one) of a much more earnest and active spirit now coming over the Unitarian body. It is on all accounts a most auspicious sign. Occasion for us has come; and with all our long and well-stored resources, religious, intellectual and material, now ready to be poured forth, there can be no doubt that the best of fruits, though long delayed, will ere long abundantly appear.

PROVINCIAL MEETING.

The annual meeting of the Presbyterian and Unitarian ministers of Lancashire and Cheshire was held at Preston on Thursday, June 21st. A large number of friends from various districts in the two counties came together and exchanged friendly greetings in the spacious enclosure attached to the venerable chapel. Towards eleven o'clock, the chapel became well filled with ministers, delegates and friends. Much interest was excited by a statement that the *first* meeting of the Assembly took place at Preston, and many were the glances cast into the chequered interval of time which was thus bridged over by a re-assembling after upwards of two hundred years. Many were the changes which a hasty glance revealed; but one thing was unchanged,—the men of to-day were as hearty in their love of truth and freedom, and as zealous in their defence, as the men of 1645. The same spirit actuated both, the same time-honoured sentiment awoke their common enthusiasm,—"Civil and religious liberty all the world over."

Rev. S. A. Steinthal introduced the service of the day in an impressive and effective manner, and the Rev. M. C. Frankland delivered an earnest and well-timed discourse from Galatians v. 13, "For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another."

At the close of the religious service a collection was made in behalf of the Missionary branch of the Assembly, when about ten guineas were obtained. This part of the business seemed to be almost entirely of an extempore character, no arrangements being made and no general notice given, and as a consequence the funds materially suffered. A very general wish was expressed that in future a distinct announcement should be made, that friends might come prepared to contribute according to their means.

An interval of a few minutes then occurred, during which we observed several ministers and friends who had come from other districts to be present at this venerable Assembly.

Rev. W. C. SQUIER, the minister of the chapel, was then, according to custom, called to the chair. In his own name and in the name of the congregation at Preston, he tendered to the Assembly a hearty welcome. He then called upon the Secretary to read the roll, when twenty-seven ministers and thirty-one delegates answered to their names. The Secretary then read a letter from the Warrington congregation, signed by Mr. Robson, in which it was stated that they declined to have any further connection with the Assembly while it was constituted as at present.

Rev. J. T. WHITEHEAD next read the report of the Committee appointed last year "to present a list of the congregations and ministers who should be considered as connected with the Assembly." The report was substantially the same as that presented last year,* with some modifications and alterations, which included the recognition of the right of a seat and vote by the various missionaries in the province. A long discussion took place, arising from the fact that the missionary colleagues of Mr. Steinthal, of Liverpool, were not included in the list of missionaries entitled to a seat in that Assembly. After the adoption of the report had been moved and seconded, Rev. J. ROBBERDS, of Liverpool, moved an amendment to the effect that wherever several missionaries were working at the same station, each should be entitled to a seat in the Assembly. Rev. F. BISHOP seconded the amendment.

A very animated and amusing discussion ensued, in which various attempts were made to define the precise difference between a minister and layman, some gentlemen contending that it was difficult to draw the line of demarcation—others, that the difference was so clear that there could be no possible mistake: on the one hand, the ministers were called clergymen; on the other, it was emphatically declared that it was a misuse of that term to apply it to Unitarian ministers at all. Ultimately a division took place, when the Chairman announced that the amendment was carried by 32 votes to 15.—Some discussion then took place upon the question whether Mr. W. J. Fox could be considered as a member of the Assembly on the ground of his having once preached before them; but it having been shewn that Mr. Fox on the occasion specified was the preacher appointed by the Unitarian Association, and not by the Assembly, it

---

* See C. R., 1859, p. 500.

was decided that to retain his name would be informal. The report, with the amendment of Mr. Robberds, was then unanimously adopted. On the motion of the Rev. T. E. Poynting, seconded by John Grundy, Esq., a cordial vote of thanks was unanimously accorded to the preacher and supporter of the day.

In a very impressive and touching manner the Rev. H. Green then made mention of the ministers who had been removed by death since the last meeting, those ministers being the Rev. C. Wallace, of Altrincham, and the Rev. W. Harrison, of Blackley.

Rev. F. Baker rose next and offered a welcome to the ministers and missionaries who had settled in the province during the past year, making mention of the Revds. J. K. Montgomery, J. Drummond, J. C. Street, W. Robinson and J. Harrop. He said that he gave to them the right hand of fellowship with all his heart.

Rev. J. K. Montgomery, as the senior minister, responded in an appropriate speech, saying that he was glad to have entered into connection with the Assembly now that it had just entered upon a new life in respect to its missionary action.

H. A. Bright, Esq., then proceeded to read the report of the Missionary branch of the Assembly,—first that of the Provincial Committee, and next those of the East Lancashire, East Cheshire and Manchester districts. Most interesting and encouraging information was given in these documents; and many who had previously questioned the wisdom of such a movement, must have felt that it was doing good service to the cause of truth and righteousness, and was receiving refreshing dews from the abundant grace of God. As these reports were ordered to be printed, it is hoped that they will soon be in the hands of all those who take an interest in the newly awaking activity of the Unitarian church. They all shew that there is work enough to be done, and that it only needs the combined action of earnest and prayerful men to do it.

On the motion of Rev. S. A. Steinthal, a Missionary Committee of the Assembly was appointed for the ensuing year.

Thomas Ainsworth, Esq., then read the report from Cleator, in which he stated that the services of the various ministers had been as useful and as acceptable as in former years, and in addition that on the three Sundays between the monthly services a Sunday-school and a church for the young were in operation. These had already proved of good service.

On the motion of Rev. G. H. Wells, the Revds. F. Baker, H. Green, W. Gaskell, J. Colston and J. T. Whitehead, were appointed a Committee to arrange the services for Cleator during the ensuing year.

Rev. J. Gordon next submitted to the Assembly a petition to the Commons' House of Parliament, in opposition to the clause, "religious profession," in the proposed Census Bill. In a clear and able speech he shewed his grounds of opposition to the measure, and called upon the Assembly to adopt and sign it. After a forcible resumé of some arguments against the measure of the Government by the Rev. C. Beard, and some spirited remarks from H. A. Bright, Esq., the Assembly unanimously adopted the petition.

Rev. H. Solly then gave notice of a motion to discontinue the name of Unitarian from the title of that Assembly.—Mr. Bright hoped that Mr. Solly would withdraw his notice of motion; the Assembly in years past had wasted time enough in the discussion of such matters, and now they wanted all their time and energies for more important work.—Rev. J. Wright afterwards announced that he should move that the word Presbyterian be left out of the title of the Assembly.

Rev. W. Binns wished the Assembly to adopt a memorial resolution on the occasion of the death of the Rev. Theodore Parker, of Boston, U.S. Much discussion ensued, in which it was urged that it would be quite as appropriate to pass a resolution on the death of Baden Powell or John Angell James,—that they had rendered services to the Unitarian church as great or greater than Theodore Parker,—and moreover that it would be quite informal, for the Assembly never referred by resolution to the death of any minister who did not belong to the province,—that no resolution was passed at the death of Dr. Channing, and that it would be injudicious to establish such a precedent on the present occasion. Much kindly feeling, however, was expressed towards Theodore Parker by many of the speakers, and some generous and appreciatory remarks were uttered; and at the request of the Assembly, Mr. Binns withdrew his motion, saying that he was quite satisfied by the expression of feeling which had taken place.

The usual formal business was afterwards transacted, the Rev. J. Gordon being elected supporter for next year,—the Provincial Committee appointed,—and it was then decided to hold the next meeting at Hyde, in Cheshire.

After a vote of thanks to the Chairman, the Assembly adjourned to the Bull's Head Hotel, where a substantial déjeuner was

provided. A large number of ladies and gentlemen sat down and shared in the hospitality of their Preston hosts. Mr. Ainsworth, of Preston, presided. Eloquent and able speeches were delivered by the Revds. C. Beard, A. Creery, S. A. Steinthal, H. Solly, F. Baker, J. Wright, W. C. Squier, Mr. Rendall, a Swedenborgian minister, Messrs. H. A. Bright and T. Dobson. At the close of the meeting, a goodly number of the friends from a distance were invited to the house of Mr. Ainsworth to partake of refreshments before leaving for their several localities.

The proceedings of the day were characterized by earnestness and hopefulness, and many new and old friends were delighted to see that the resolutions which last year were passed after such prolonged discussions were found to have worked with great satisfaction and to have been productive of good results. May we not hope that the Assembly has just entered upon a career of usefulness which will lead to more cheering consequences year by year? If ministers and laymen will but sink all lesser differences and join heart and hand in united efforts, no man can estimate the great blessings which will follow.

PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGE, CARMARTHEN.

The annual examination at the above College took place on the 19th, 20th, 21st and 22nd of June, and was conducted by the deputation from the Presbyterian Board in London (Rev. T. L. Marshall and J. C. Lawrence, Esq.), assisted by the Rev. E. Higginson, of Swansea, and the Rev. Stephenson Hunter, of Wolverhampton, the newly-appointed Hebrew and Mathematical Professor at the College.

The examination commenced on Tuesday, the 19th, at 9 a. m., when the junior class was examined by Rev. T. L. Marshall in Virgil and Sallust in the principal room; and when the first, second and third classes were examined in the library in Euclid, Algebra and Trigonometry, by the Rev. S. Hunter. At half-past ten, the third class was examined by Rev. E. Higginson in Homer and the Memorabilia of Xenophon; and at half-past eleven, the senior class was examined by him in Paley's Natural Theology. From half-past eleven to one, Mr. Marshall examined very carefully and critically the second class in the Georgics of Virgil (Book iii.) and the Æneid (Book v.), being the classical books specified for the Matriculation Examination in Latin in the London University this session. The deputation, examiners and visitors, retired from one to two for refreshments. In the afternoon, the examination began with the senior class in the Medea of Euripides by Mr. Marshall; at the same time the examination in Mathematics and Hebrew was continued by Mr. Hunter in the library. From three to four, the third class was examined by Mr. Marshall in Homer and the Crito of Plato; whilst the examination was continued in the library in Hebrew and Church History by Messrs. Higginson and Hunter. From four to five, the third class was examined, *viva voce*, by Mr. Hunter in Hebrew, which terminated the proceedings of the first day.

On Wednesday, from 9 to 10 a. m., the senior German class was examined, *viva voce*, by Mr. Hunter; and the junior Logic class by Mr. Marshall. From half-past ten to twelve, prelections in the theological department by Rev. E. Higginson, and the second Logic class in the library by Mr. Marshall. From half-past eleven to one, the senior class in the Epistles of Horace and the Agricola of Tacitus by Rev. T. L. Marshall, and the second Hebrew class by Mr. Hunter.—After luncheon, the examination was commenced in Butler's Three Sermons and Analogy by Mr. Higginson, and in Jahn's Antiquities by Mr. Marshall. The third German class was also examined by Mr. Hunter. From four to five, the third class was examined in Butler's Analogy by Mr. Higginson.

On Thursday morning, the proceedings began with the senior class in the Apology of Socrates and the Greek Testament critically and exegetically by Mr. Higginson. At 11, the examination for Mr. Sharpe's Prizes commenced, in the presence of all the examiners, visitors and students, conducted in the most efficient and interesting manner by Mr. Higginson, in Biblical Antiquities, Geography and Criticism. This part of the examination always excites great interest, from the importance of the subject and the ready answers of the students.—In the afternoon, some of the junior classes continued to be examined in German, Hebrew, &c.

On Friday morning, at 10 a. m., Rev. T. L. Marshall proceeded to the distribution of the Prizes, but before doing so addressed the students and visitors in a very impressive manner upon the general results of the examination. The first Prize in the first class was awarded to Mr. David E. Edwards; the first Prize in the second class was given to Mr. Jonah Evans; and the first Prize in the third class, to Mr. Edmonds: the second Prize in this class was divided between D. W. Davies and Lewis Davies, being equal. In the junior class, the first Prize was awarded to W. D. Frances, and the second to David Evans,

The first Prize in Mr. Sharpe's examination was given to Mr. John Davies, Sen., as well as the Prize for the best paper on Greek History; and the second Prize was given to Mr. Edmonds.—Mr. Higginson, in announcing the result of the examination in Mr. Sharpe's subjects, spoke very highly of the attainments and acquirements of Mr. J. Davies, Sen., who obtained the first Prize, and expressed his sincere hope that next year the number of candidates for these valuable Prizes would be increased. After a very powerful address from Mr. Lawrence on the general progress of the students and the respectable character of the present examination, the proceedings were concluded with prayer by the Rev. H. Jones, the Independent minister of the town.

On Thursday, the deputation invited the examiners, the visitors, and the ministers of different denominations present, to dinner; and a very pleasant evening was spent in the exercise of Christian fellowship and the exchange of kind and cordial feelings. Some very excellent speeches were delivered, and the party separated at an early hour. D.

THE NEW CENSUS BILL.

The portion of the Bill now before the House of Commons which requires a statement of the "religious profession" of every individual enumerated in the Census, has given general dissatisfaction among Protestant Dissenters, and this feeling is shared by many liberal Churchmen both in and out of Parliament. By means of public meetings and resolutions and petitions, expression is daily given to the feeling of dislike which this clause excites. It is supposed that it has been suggested by some Churchmen more zealous than scrupulous, with a view of counteracting the impression made by the last Census, and which shewed that in the number of worshipers on a given day the Dissenters had the advantage of the members of the Established Church. Churchmen now say that the returns were fraudulent and deceptive. Suppose that what they say were granted, it would scarcely justify the present plan for taking a religious enumeration of the people, unless the statesman is justified in following the prescription of an impudent wit, who said that the best way of counteracting a mischievous lie is to tell a bigger lie on the other side. It is an absurdity to ask for a statement of "religious profession" from multitudes who have and who profess no religion. Putting aside the case of children and insane persons, there are thousands on thousands who know nothing and care nothing about religion either in profession or practice. Are all these, together with the inmates of our jails and workhouses, to be swept into the capacious net of the Church of England? There is in the present state of the law of the country, of which Christianity is said to be "part and parcel," an objection to the required statement of religious profession from persons who reject Christianity. It is wrong for the law to ask a man to do that for which it prescribes and threatens a punishment. It is quite contrary to the genius of the English constitution for a man to be required by law to furnish the evidence of his own criminality. But let a man write himself down Atheist under the religious profession heading, it might, we presume, unless an indemnity clause is added to the Bill, be made the basis of criminal proceedings against him. Increased importance is given to the subject through what is reported to have recently taken place at a meeting between the Premier and certain Conservative leaders and Churchmen. Lord Palmerston very rashly promised (if he be correctly reported) to retain the clause, and received the promise of the support of Mr. Benjamin Disraeli and his party. Lord Palmerston ought to have looked with suspicion on the promise of Parliamentary support from such a quarter. He may be assured that it will only be given with a view of damaging him, or of circumscribing the principle of civil and religious liberty. If, however, in addition to other imprudent words, Lord Palmerston said (as the newspapers report) that the census of the religious profession was required and would be valuable as the basis of future legislation, it behoves all who would resist Church-of-England aggressiveness to do what they can to frustrate the scheme. We cannot too emphatically, whether against Churchmen or Dissenters, assert that numbers have nothing to do with the application of a principle. If there were but hundreds where there actually are millions of Nonconformists, their religious rights would in truth and reason be equally strong and sacred. The expressed determination of Dissenters of every class and denomination to refuse an answer to the inquiry respecting their "religious profession" has called forth many contemptuous and calumnious remarks from clerical and Tory writers, and from the Hobbists of the *Saturday Review*. They smile at the plea of conscience; but we must in all seriousness remind them that they must not measure other men's consciences by their own. In the matter of religion, each man is answerable to his Maker alone. The writers in the Saturday

Review sneer alike at the zeal of High-churchmen and the anger of "little Bethel or Bethesda" in the matter of this religious profession clause, but give the weight of their authority in favour of Churchmen. Dissenters are in their eyes low and vulgar people, and too ready to exaggerate where their religion is concerned. But vulgarity and the habit of exaggeration are not statutable offences, and an impartial observer might find specimens of vulgar insolence in boards of green cloth, around which aristocrats of the purest water habitually sit, and in combination-rooms frequented by Church and University authorities, as well as in "little Bethel." We have not wasted words by speaking of the penalty which the Bill as printed would affix to the refusal of information as to religious profession. That clause was withdrawn as soon as the objection to it was stated; but its existence in the original Bill shews clearly enough the animus of its author, and the necessity of unrelaxed watchfulness on the part of those who think religious liberty worthy of regard. We believe that, whatever may be the decision of Parliament on this clause of the Bill, the Churchmen to whose craft or zeal we owe this requirement of individual religious profession have made a great blunder. Had they renewed the Census Bill as in 1851, we do not doubt that the returns would have been, on comparison, very favourable to the Church of England, for never were greater exertions made by that Church than during the last ten years. But the returns which will be gained through the agency of enumerators under the new Census Bill will deceive no one, however offensively they may be used to depreciate the condition and influence of English Nonconformity. It has been well said that the Bill imposes on the officers of the Census an "impossible and presumptuous task." Of the minute divisions of religious belief in England, few even of educated men, when free from sectarian bias, are able to speak with accuracy. What a mass of unconscious blundering or of party misrepresentation may not be anticipated as the result of the labours of the enumerators employed under the new Census Bill! It will be a sad waste of time, public money and religious peace, if the inquiry is persisted in; but we hope, in answer to the numerous petitions now flowing into the House of Commons, the clause will be soon withdrawn.

STATUE OF DR. PRIESTLEY AT OXFORD.

The Statue of the eminent philosopher *who has* taken his undisputed place as the father of Pneumatic Chemistry (and whose memory is dear to thousands for his services in the work of Christian reformation), is finished, and has been erected on the appointed site in the noble Museum of Oxford. The sculptor, by whose energy and zeal the work has been completed in time for the statue to be placed before the meeting of the British Association for promoting Science at Oxford, is Mr. E. B. Stephens, of Pimlico. His work was inspected by the Committee before it was despatched to its destination, and has, we believe, given them perfect satisfaction. The statue is about the size of life. It is a coincidence that the proportions prescribed for all the statues at Oxford, 5 ft. 6 in., are exactly those of Priestley in life. He is chiselled in the attitude of speaking, with a manuscript in the left hand, and dressed in the costume of the last century, such as it is known Dr. Priestley was accustomed to wear. In respect to the likeness, the sculptor had the aid of all existing portraits, busts and medallions; and although these exhibited perplexing varieties,* he has, we believe, hit upon the features and expression and attitude which the comparison of his materials justifies, and which artistic taste would best approve. A support to the figure in a statue being always required, Mr. Stephens has very happily, we think, introduced in it a model in bas-relief of the electrical machine used by Dr. Priestley in working his important experiments. The original of this machine is now in the possession of J. A. Bostock, Esq., M. D. We learn that the statue has, since it has been placed in the Museum, been inspected by some of the officers and authorities of the Museum and the University, and has given them perfect satisfaction. The cost is provided for by a public subscription, which is still open, *and to which further contributions are sought.* Our Advertising sheet contains a list of the contributors so far. It is intended, we believe, that every subscriber should receive a copy of a photograph which has been taken of the statue, and also one of a very early and particularly pleasing portrait of Priestley, which has never yet been engraved or published. We have only to express to Mr. James Yates the gratitude due to him for the zeal and success with which he has taken up and carried through this work. It is intended to celebrate the erection of the statue by a public breakfast at Oxford of

* Mr. Yates has drawn up a description of these portraits and busts, which we hope he will allow us hereafter to print for the benefit of our readers.

the subscribers to it, to be held on Tuesday, July 3rd, at nine o'clock, at an hotel yet to be selected, and of which information may be obtained at the reception-room in Oxford.

TESTIMONIAL TO REV. THOMAS MADGE.

Mr. Madge has just received from the members of the congregation over which he presided for so many years at Essex Street, with an acceptance and popularity never probably surpassed in Unitarian congregational history, a very handsome gift, as a testimonial of the feelings which his late flock cherish towards him. It consists of a massive and handsome Silver Salver and a purse of a Thousand Guineas. The Salver has inscribed on it these words:

To
The Reverend THOMAS MADGE,
who
faithfully for four-and-thirty years
bore eloquent testimony to the Truths
of the Christian Religion,
as
Minister of Essex-Street Chapel,
in worthy succession to three honoured
Labourers
in the Church of Christ,
Lindsey, Disney and Belsham;
This Memorial
(with a Thousand Guineas)
was presented on his retirement,
by
The Members of his Congregation,
in grateful acknowledgment
of his Public Services,
and as an expression of their affection for
him
as their personal Friend.
May, 1860.

We understand that the munificent present is enhanced in value to Mr. Madge's feelings by the delicate mode in which all the proceedings connected with it were conducted, and the spontaneous zeal manifested in all quarters in carrying the testimonial out. The letters which follow will further explain the history of the testimonial.

Letter accompanying Salver.

9th June, 1860.

Dear Mr. Madge,—When the Trustees of Essex-Street Chapel called the subscribers together, in November, 1858, to receive the announcement that you had resigned the office of Minister of the Chapel, an office which for thirty-four years you had held with so much benefit and satisfaction to them, the impression produced was one of heartfelt and general regret; for none of your hearers had perceived any diminution of those powers which had so eminently qualified you for the discharge of your high duties.

The resolutions which were then passed by the subscribers, and communicated to you, assured you of their grateful appreciation of your services, and their best wishes for your future happiness, and conveyed to you their warmest thanks for your kind and disinterested offer to assist in conducting the religious services of the chapel after the appointment of your successor.

At the time of passing these resolutions, a general desire was felt and expressed by the members of your congregation to add some further and more lasting evidence of their feelings towards you. In furtherance of this desire, the pleasing duty has been confided to us of assisting in carrying it into execution. The task we have had to perform has been an easy and most agreeable one. We had but to indicate the Bank into which contributions might be paid, and a hearty and general response was the immediate result.

We have now, in fulfilment of our duty, to request, on behalf of the members of your congregation, that you will do them the favour to accept the accompanying memorial of their grateful and affectionate remembrance of you as their Pastor and Friend.

We remain, dear Mr. Madge,
With the sincerest respect,
Your obliged and faithful Friends,

ELHANAN BICKNELL,	GEO. LONG,
W. STRICKLAND COOKSON,	JOHN SMALE,
ROBERT DUNN,	JOHN TAYLOR,
WILLIAM LAWRENCE,	JOHN WATSON,
WILLIAM SHARPE,	PH. WORSLEY.

To the Reverend Thomas Madge.

Mr. Madge's Answer.

To the Members of the Congregation attending, during my Ministry, at Essex-Street Chapel.

Dear Friends,—I beg you to accept my warmest thanks for the signal mark of esteem and regard which I have just received from you. The letter addressed to me on the occasion would of itself have been sufficiently gratifying. But, accompanied as it was with so munificent a gift, and the beautiful Salver, graven with the record of it, and which, I trust, will descend to my children as a cherished memorial of the honour done to their father, I have no words to express, as I would desire to do, the feelings which it has awakened in my heart. Earnestly do I wish that my public ministrations had been more worthy of such a testimonial, and of the generous liberality to which alone it must be ascribed. I can only say that of this and the many

instances of considerate and friendly attention shewn to me for a series of years past, I shall retain to the last moment of conscious existence a lively and grateful remembrance. Nor can I look back upon the period of my ministry among you without the pleasing reflection, that, throughout the whole of it, our harmony was never disturbed by a single word of discord or contention. And when, at length, the time seemed to have come for the termination of a connection which, happily for myself, had so long subsisted between us, it was sincerely and from the heart that, in taking leave of you as your appointed minister, I could bid to one and all of you an affectionate farewell. Conscious, however, as I am, of the imperfections and deficiencies with which my humble labours in the service of our common Master were attended, and notwithstanding the satisfaction derived from your kind but too favourable appreciation of them, it would still add to that satisfaction could I be assured that they had served in any degree to satisfy the minds of the inquiring and to strengthen the faith of the wavering, to give relief to the anxious and troubled spirit, and consolation to that of the sorrowing and bereaved. With the hope that, to some extent, this may have been the case, and with earnest wishes and prayers for the real and enduring welfare of yourselves, your families and all who are dear to you, I remain, your faithful and grateful Friend,

THOMAS MADGE.

20, Highbury Terrace, June 11, 1860.

EASTERN UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN SOCIETY.

The forty-sixth anniversary of this Society was held on Friday, June 22, at the pleasant town of Framlingham. The day was fortunately fine, and there were friends present from Norwich, Bury, Yarmouth, Diss, Hapton, Ipswich and other places. The devotional service was conducted by Rev. Henry Squire, of Yarmouth, and the sermon was preached by Rev. R. Brook Aspland, on the Moral and Spiritual Dominion of Jesus Christ. The entire service was listened to by a respectable congregation, composed in part of members of orthodox churches in Framlingham, with marked attention and interest. At the close of the service the business meeting was formed, Mr. Leech, of Bury St. Edmunds, being in the chair. The Treasurer's report shewed an income of £39, and an expenditure which left a balance of nearly £9. Rev. D. Davis read the Committee's report. It described plans of missionary *action* which had been meditated and discussed for Bungay, Eye, &c.; but in each case the difficulties were felt to surpass the prospect of advantageous result, and nothing had been done. Allusion was made to the former communication by the Society to the British and Foreign Unitarian Association on the subject of a supply of Unitarian and religious tracts, and gratification was expressed that there was now a prospect of the wish being complied with. The Society had been in communication on the subject of tracts with Rev. Brooke Herford, of Sheffield, and hoped to receive shortly a supply from him. Reference was made to the condition and prospects of the congregations at Norwich, Yarmouth, Diss and Hapton; and Rev. Thomas Cooper gave a verbal report of the state of things at Framlingham, as did Rev. J. Cooper of that at Ipswich.

The condition of the Octagon congregation, Norwich, appeared to be more prosperous than has been for many years past the case. In the other societies, the ground was, for the most part, well kept, though not being extended. The report alluded, in conclusion, to the departed worthies of the Unitarian body, the Committee adopting on this subject the concluding portion of the report of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association. The adoption of the report was moved by Rev. Henry Squire; and Mr. Edward Taylor moved and Rev. Thomas Cooper seconded a vote of thanks to the preacher. The next annual meeting was voted to be at Norwich.

Mr. Edward Taylor, in a brief but forcible speech, exposed the great impropriety of the religious-profession clause in the Census Bill, and moved the adoption by the Society of a Petition to the House of Commons against it. The resolution was seconded by Mr. Hill, of Framlingham, and unanimously adopted.—A vote of welcome was proposed to the deputation from the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, the Society being represented on this occasion by the Secretary and Professor Edward Taylor. The former, in acknowledging the vote, explained the objects of the Association and the claims it had on the more liberal support of the Unitarians of Great Britain. Professor Taylor expressed his strong confidence in the Association, the proceedings of which he had watched with unflagging interest from the beginning—nay, he had been a member of the Unitarian Fund, the predecessor of the Association, from its formation by the late Robert Aspland,—a man in whose steps he had always been proud and happy to follow.—Rev. D. Davis called the attention of the Society to the existence of a considerable stock of tracts lying useless

in the depôt. A resolution was passed authorizing the Committee to distribute the tracts among the different congregations.

The interval between the business and the social meeting was occupied by the strangers in visiting the noble church, inspecting the monuments and tombs, one of which is erected to the memory of Rev. S. Say Toms, for more than fifty years the Unitarian minister at Framlingham; also the interesting ruins of the Castle, associated with some remarkable incidents in English history.—Early in the afternoon, the members of the Association and their friends assembled in the largest room of the Crown and Anchor Hotel. It was completely filled by the assembled guests. The chair was taken by Mr. Edward Taylor, who delighted his old friends by a series of spirited addresses, breathing his accustomed love of liberty and his ardent attachment to the faith which some of his ancestors and family have adorned by their learning and virtues. Various interesting addresses were given by Rev. D. Davis, Rev. Henry Squire, Rev. R. B. Aspland, Rev. Thomas Cooper, Rev. J. Ellis, Rev. J. Cooper, and other friends. The absence of some accustomed attendants and friends was regretted. Had some who have desired to see the Association given up been present, they would probably at least have acquiesced in the sentiment warmly expressed by several, that if the Association did nothing else each year than bring together the ministers and members in friendly intercourse, to cheer one another by mutual sympathy, it had its use. The party did not break up until the time for some of the friends to take the railway train had arrived. Mr. Edward Taylor expressed, in behalf of the assembly, respect and regard for the minister of Framlingham, who was proving himself the right man in the right place, and conciliating the respect of men of all sects and parties.

MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE, LONDON.

The annual examination began on the morning of Monday, June 25, at University Hall. The proceedings commenced with the junior Hebrew, and Mr. R. Martineau called upon the class to translate passages (explaining grammatical points therein) from the book of Genesis. The class, consisting of Messrs. Smyth, Gordon, J. C. Smyth and Odgers, gave satisfactory (though varying in degree) proofs of attention and progress.—Professor Martineau next took the class in Ethics, consisting of Messrs. Copeland and Mitchell, and stated that the examination would be necessarily imperfect, as the business of the class had been seriously interrupted by the ill health of both gentlemen. The question paper contained thirty-eight questions of the searching character usual in this department of the College curriculum. One interesting feature in it was the distinct refutation of Pantheism which the answers contained, and another was the reference to the relation borne by some of the ancient philosophers to Christianity. Making the allowance claimed for his class by the Professor, the examination was not otherwise than satisfactory.—The next class on the list was that of Christian Truths and Evidences (Professor Tayler's department), junior and middle class. Professor Martineau expressed regret at the necessity that had arisen of his personating Mr. Tayler, who, though better, was forbidden, in consequence of the state of the weather, by his medical man to leave the house. A very interesting examination ensued; the answers were, with few exceptions, full and very satisfactory, according to the mode in which the subject had been treated by the Professor. The class consisted of Messrs. Mitchell, Copeland, Gordon and Howse. Mr. J. D. H. Smith was absent through severe illness. A sermon was then delivered by Mr. Mitchell, from Psalm cxxxix. 23, 24.—After a short interval devoted to luncheon, Professor Martineau resumed the examination with the class of undergraduates in Latin. The object of this examination is to test the work of the undergraduates in their classes in University College. He had a weekly class for this object, and had read with them the books necessary for the degree examination. The examination was taken first in Virgil's Eclogues and Georgics and then in Cicero de Oratore.—Professor Martineau next (for Professor Tayler) took the senior class in Christian Truths and Evidences, the class consisting of Messrs. Dare, Heaviside and Bakewell. The question paper, including fifteen principal questions (each of these branching into several subordinate questions), gave indications of a most instructive series of lectures, and the answers proved that the students had paid attention to the lectures. Mr. Dare's answers were particularly full and generally accurate.—The last class of the day was the senior Latin, who have read during the session, with Professor Martineau, Cicero de Naturâ Deorum and some treatises of Seneca. The proceedings of the day were brought to a close by Mr. Heaviside, who delivered a sermon from Matthew v. 48.—There were present during portions of the examination, in addition to the Professors, Rev. William Gaskell, the Visitor, Mr. James Heywood, Mr. Samuel Sharpe, Mr.

H. C. Robinson, Mr. S. D. Darbishire, Mr. R. D. Darbishire, Mr. Leyson Lewis, Mr. Richard Aspden, Rev. Thomas Madge, Rev. Dr. Sadler, Rev. L. Lewis, Rev. H. Hutton, Rev. R. Shaen, Rev. John Gordon, Rev. R. B. Aspland.

The examination was resumed on Tuesday, June 26. The classes of the day were the middle Hebrew, the junior and middle Ecclesiastical History, Mental Philosophy, the undergraduate Greek class, the History of Doctrine, and the senior Ecclesiastical History; and the day's proceedings closed with a sermon by Mr. Bakewell from Rom. xiv. 7. The most interesting incident of the day was the appearance of Rev. J. J. Tayler in the hall to examine the class of undergraduates in Greek. He was cordially congratulated by his friends on his convalescence. Among the visitors of the day were Mr. Ainsworth, the President, Mr. Eddowes Bowman, Mr. E. W. Field, Mr. Jerom Murch, Mr. W. Shaen, Rev. J. P. Ham, Rev. J. P. Malleson and Rev. T. L. Marshall. — The examination was brought to a close on Wednesday, but other engagements prevented our attendance, except during a short time, the two last days. We are informed that, as a whole, the examination was thought to be very satisfactory.

The proceedings of the examination closed with the Visitor's address, which was delivered by Rev. William Gaskell with his accustomed skill and power. Addressing the students as our future ministers, and viewing the position which they were preparing to occupy, from the vantage-ground of a somewhat wider experience than their own, he set before them what appeared to him some of the leading demands which it would make upon them, and urged them, by a regard to their future usefulness in the world, to endeavour to become equal to these. We will not do the admirable address of Mr. Gaskell the injustice of a hasty and imperfect report, especially as we are authorized to promise to our readers the opportunity of perusing it in a future No. of our Magazine.

During the week a meeting of the Committee was held in University Hall. This is a new and satisfactory arrangement, enabling the London members of the Committee to meet their colleagues. At this meeting matters of very considerable importance were discussed and settled.—The Trustees' meeting took place on Thursday, June 28, and we believe five new students were admitted; and in the evening there was the usual gay assemblage in the Library and Common Hall at the examination soirée.—It may be new to many of *our readers* to learn that Professor Martineau will spend a portion of the College recess in America. He crosses the Atlantic at the urgent request of our friends there, and is to preach in October the sermon before the American Unitarian Congress. We do not doubt that he will be received by the Unitarians of America with honour and enthusiasm, and we hope that his visit will create a new and friendly link between the liberal theologians of England and America.

GRAHAM-STREET SCHOOL, BIRMINGHAM.

The social meeting of subscribers and friends was held in the school-house on Monday, June 11, being the Centenary of the School; the Mayor, Thos. Lloyd, Esq., in the chair.

The first resolution, moved by Abel Peyton, Esq., seconded by Arthur Ryland, Esq., and carried unanimously, was as follows:

"That this meeting of subscribers and friends to the Protestant Dissenting Charity School, now situated in Graham Street, Newhall Hill, and devoted to the maintaining and educating for domestic service of Poor Girls from any locality, and of any religious denomination, desire, on this occasion of the Centenary of the School, to record their gratitude to Almighty God for the abundant success which He has granted to the benevolent labours of the original founders of this Institution and of its supporters throughout the last hundred years; their unabated confidence in the enlightened, liberal and eminently Christian principles on which the School has been, from its very commencement, conducted; and their earnest purpose, in reliance on the same Divine blessing, still to carry on the School in a spirit worthy of these principles, and of the truly useful and beneficent objects which it is designed to accomplish."

Moved by James Hunt, Esq., seconded by Mr. Edward Ridge, and resolved unanimously—2. "That the best thanks of this meeting be presented to the Rev. Charles Clarke, for his kindness in preaching the annual sermon on behalf of this Charity, in the Old Meeting-house, on Sunday morning, June 3rd, and for the great zeal and ability with which he urged its claims to support."

Moved by Archibald Kenrick, Esq., seconded by Mr. Chas. Clifford, and resolved unanimously—3. "That the best thanks of this meeting be given to the Rev. Samuel Bache, for his kindness in preaching the annual sermon at the New Meeting-house, on Sunday morning, June 10th; for his invaluable services as Secretary, during

a period of twenty-six years; and for his untiring zeal in the support of this Charity."

Moved by Mr. A. F. Osler, seconded by Mr. William Ryland, and resolved unanimously—4. "That the best thanks of this meeting be given to the Ladies who kindly instructed the children in singing their hymns."

Moved by Mr. Brooke Smith, seconded by Mr. Thomas Warden, and resolved unanimously—5. "That the cordial thanks of this meeting be presented to the Treasurer, Mr. W. G. Postans, for the assiduity and efficiency with which he watches over and promotes the financial interests, in particular, of this School."

Moved by Mr. W. G. Postans, seconded by Mr. William Earl, and resolved unanimously—6. "That this meeting desire to express their grateful sense of obligation to those subscribers who have kindly given to the Centenary Fund the sanction of their names as members of the Finance Committee, and who have themselves contributed so handsomely towards it."

Moved by Mr. Joseph Foxall, seconded by Mr. W. Rolason, and resolved unanimously—7. "That the Secretary be requested to record the proceedings of this social meeting in the Minute-book."

The children were then introduced into the room, and the Mayor distributed prizes for good conduct, which had been previously selected, to seventeen of them, saying a kind word of encouragement to each; after which they sang one of their hymns.

The Mayor having left the chair, and the same having been taken by James Hunt, Esq., it was moved by the Rev. Samuel Bache, seconded by the Rev. Chas. Clarke, and resolved unanimously—8. "That the most respectful and cordial thanks of this meeting be given to the Mayor, Thomas Lloyd, Esq., for the kindness with which he has complied with the request of the Committee, in giving his official sanction to this School as one of the benevolent institutions of the borough of Birmingham, by presiding over its Centenary commemoration this evening in his official capacity, and for the ability and courtesy with which he has conducted the proceedings of this meeting."

BRITISH AND FOREIGN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

The thirty-fifth anniversary of this Society was held on Wednesday, May 30th, and the fineness of the day (a rare privilege this singular season) concurred with many other circumstances to make the meeting eminently successful. At the religious service, which was held in Essex-Street chapel, a very fine congregation assembled, including all the Unitarian ministers of the London district (except Rev. J. Martineau), and ministers from every part of England, and some from Ireland (in all more than forty). It was a pleasing thing to see, for the first time for many years, the Unitarian churches of the North well represented as they were on this occasion by ministers from Lancashire and Yorkshire; the Midland counties were also well represented.

The introductory religious service was impressively conducted by Rev. P. W. Clayden, of Nottingham. The sermon was preached by Rev. Dr. Sadler, of Hampstead, and well rewarded the close attention given to it by that remarkable congregation. Its true evangelical tone, its Christian fidelity, and its careful and candid statements, especially when referring to those that differ from Unitarians, made a strong impression on all. The preacher's subject was, "Through Jesus to the Father, or the Spiritual Gain of the Unitarian Faith." He took as his text 2 Tim. iii. 7, "Ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth." After dwelling shortly on the apostle's principle of religious liberty, the preacher proceeded to remark:

"If there be in this world anything which we need to have *fixed*, it is our religious principles. However conscientiously we may refrain from dogmatizing over others, do we not deeply feel that there are some questions which, so far as our own faith is concerned, i. e. as individuals, we cannot be content to leave open all our lives?

"Though, however, a settled faith be attainable and essential to our spiritual health, it is manifestly our duty not to shrink from *hard thinking* on the grandest and most momentous themes that could occupy the mind of man or angel. . . . . .

"While we relax not in the least degree in our adherence to the broad, catholic principles which have made us what we are, and given us houses which we built not and lands which we planted not—while we would leave our children as free to change as, thank God, our fathers left us—while we would not lord it over any brother's conscience, but stand humbly side by side as in the presence of our common Lord,—we are yet holders and teachers of distinct religious opinions. Why should we value our faith less because we have gained it from primary sources, and insisted on free access to these sources that we might gain it there? Indeed, we cannot but regard it as the first-born of religious

liberty; and as we value the daughter all the more from her true and lofty origin, so we cannot help loving the mother the better for having produced what seems to us so fair a child.

"How, then, can I describe the essential characteristic of our system of Christian doctrine, as distinguished from that of other sects? I think we shall be agreed that it is, in one word, a *truer conception of the Heavenly Father*. The glory of Christ shines brightly in the popular creeds; his might, his tenderness, his living presence, are in the mouths of innumerable multitudes; but, though he has been so long time with us, though the Christian age numbers now its eighteen centuries, we cannot help feeling that not yet is the Father known."

Dr. Sadler then proceeded to shew, and in a manner strikingly convincing, that the practical defect of the orthodox system is, that it virtually removes the Father to a distance, and takes from Him those relations which keep Him in our thoughts and bring Him near to our hearts. The simple doctrine of the new Testament is, the Father revealed in Christ. As the sermon is already, in accordance with the unanimous wish of the Committee of the Association, committed to the press, we will not now stay to describe the mode in which Dr. Sadler arranged and conducted his proof that the Unitarian faith includes and makes much of every portion of this revelation. The preacher, in conclusion, urged Unitarians to realize their relation of sonship to Almighty God, and to make up their minds to the sacrifices which Christian faithfulness demanded of them. With these excellent counsels and consolations he closed his discourse:

"It may be urged, But our *peculiar* sacrifices are so trifling and so few. Be it so; perhaps all the more subtle and dangerous is the temptation to escape them. But there are at least petty deprivations in belonging to a small sect not yet generally admitted into the Christian fold. We have not to bear the heavy cross which weighs us down to the grave; but the little daily cross, which hardly seems a cross at all, must not be thrown off because it is so light. When the Unitarian martyr George Van Paris was burnt at Smithfield, he kissed the stake at which his life was offered up. We need to bear our lesser trials in the same spirit. Let no minister give way to the dream of wider influence by not being quite so strictly true to his convictions. We must not measure influence by rank or numbers; nay, we should be intent rather on standing where God *places us*, than on measuring influence at all. In the presence of the truth, let no mother think of a larger social circle for her daughters, no father of better worldly prospects for his son. The smallness of our numbers, instead of making us cold and indifferent, should unite us more closely as by a kind of family love.

"A little while, and those who agree with us, and those who differ from us, all will be where we shall no longer see darkly as through a glass. The views we hold are now judged at the bar of public opinion in England in this 19th century; in a little while, we shall be at another tribunal and not in time at all. The truth we seek, therefore, and the standard of character we set before us, must be chosen by us as in the solemn presence of God and eternity. We must think, not of the opinion of this man or that, this age or that, but take home to our hearts the golden rule of St. Francis, 'Lord, what I am in thy sight, that am I really and no more.'

"A little while; yes, and here to-day these words are echoed in affecting tones by friends who, being dead, yet speak, by fathers and brethren who in the past year have been numbered with the departed; the earnest and eloquent Harris, the faithful and estimable Benjamin Carpenter, and the simple-hearted but high and pure minded, the genuinely devout and by all beloved, Dr. Hutton. My fellow-christians, we will give heed to their warning; we accept the trust they have handed down to us; we will enter into their labours."

A collection amounting to £28 was then made.

The meeting for business was then formed, Charles Paget, Esq., M.P., the President, taking the chair; and it was pleasant to see that the greater part of the congregation remained, and appeared to take the warmest interest in the Committee's report and the sentiments uttered by the several speakers when introducing the resolutions. In the absence of the Treasurer, through an unavoidable professional engagement, Mr. J. E. Clennell, the Financial Secretary, read the statement of accounts for 1859. The income for the year was £1111. 12*s.* 2*d.*, and the expenditure had been £978. The balance in hand, £138. 4*s.* 2*d.*, contrasted favourably with the balance of the previous year, which amounted to only £4. 12*s.* In fact, the balance on the first of January, 1859, was heavily against the Society, there being a large arrear of unpaid debts and of votes for amounts not paid, all of which have been liquidated during the year.

The Secretary, Rev. R. Brook Aspland, then proceeded to read the principal portions of the Committee's report. Its

length and the important business which followed prevented him from reading the whole. It began with congratulation on the altered and improved prospects of the Association and of the Unitarian cause in England. It described the very satisfactory working of the new portions of the constitution, and paid a well-deserved tribute to the services rendered during his year of office by Mr. Paget. It next alluded to the amended By-laws of the Committee which had been drawn up for the regulation of the Committee's proceedings. One object aimed at, and it is believed secured, by those regulations, is to restrict the Committee in all pecuniary operations to the funds actually possessed by them, and to prohibit their pledging or tying up by future grants the funds to be distributed by their successors in office. In directing attention to Foreign operations, India claims the first place. The reports received, while still manifesting the earnest zeal of the missionaries, especially of Mr. Dall, do not convey the impression of success proportionate to the self-denial and energy of our missionaries. Mr. Dall is establishing, at great personal cost and labour to himself, schools for all. Limited as the Committee's funds are and wide as is the field on which they are called to labour, the doubt was expressed whether they would be justified in acting on Mr. Dall's invitation to become liberal supporters of the schools. In respect to Transylvania, the report contained much interesting matter, and recommended the strengthening the bonds of union between the Unitarians of that country and of England, by receiving and helping to maintain a succession of Magyar students, in accordance with a very judicious plan detailed to the Committee, first orally and more recently still in a letter, by Mr. John Paget, of Klausenburg. An excellent address from the Synod of Klausenburg to the Unitarians of England was read, and at a later period of the proceedings an appropriate and eloquent reply was proposed by Rev. Samuel Bache and unanimously adopted by the meeting. In turning to Home operations, the Committee were able to give proof of the good fruits of the new part of their Constitution which had enabled them to summon to their counsels various correspondents among the more eminent Unitarians in different parts of the kingdom. From Ireland, a valuable letter had been received from Rev. J. Scott Porter; from Scotland, Rev. R. B. Drummond and Rev. W. H. Crosskey had sent letters of considerable interest, shewing that the good cause of Unitarianism is keeping its ground against all its opponents. From various parts of England letters had been received, describing much active zeal, and in some instances marked progress. In Yorkshire, Lancashire and Cheshire, missionary plans are being organized which promise satisfactory results. The letters of Rev. Brooke Herford, detailing his plans in and around Sheffield; of Rev. J. H. Ryland and Rev. Goodwyn Barmby, describing what was doing in the West Riding of York; of Rev. W. Gaskell, describing the plans in the Manchester district; and of Rev. John Wright, respecting those in the Bury district,—were heard with very deep interest and approval. The Committee expressed their heartfelt satisfaction at the development of missionary zeal among the Unitarians of the North and in other parts of the country, and their desire to co-operate with them in any way that would produce the best results. A marked reference was made to the earnest call for new and popular Unitarian tracts, the Committee acknowledging the necessity of such an issue, and expressing their desire to meet the wishes of their correspondents. The expenditure of the Society had been inconveniently limited by claims of old standing. The largest grant of the year had been made to the new Unitarian church at Southampton, the Committee feeling it a duty to aid the zealous minister and congregation in that town. To the missionary cause at Woolwich, now ably represented by Mr. M'Alister, the Committee had granted aid. To Aberdeen and several other places it had continued to make the needed grants. In conclusion, the Committee referred to some recently departed worthies who had been their own or their predecessors' associates in Unitarian action.

The report took more than an hour in reading, but was listened to with evident interest. The addresses which were delivered in moving and seconding the various resolutions were spirited and harmonious. We regret that we find ourselves precluded by want of space from using the full report we had prepared. Mr. Herbert New, in moving the adoption of the report, went over the principal topics contained in it, and claimed for the executive of the Association a larger amount of support than it had hitherto received.—Rev. John Wright, of Bury, in a powerful address, seconded the resolution, especially approving of the part of the report which referred to a large issue of Unitarian tracts, and urging the Association to do it boldly and on a large scale, issuing during the year a million of tracts, and gave them the promise of assistance in their circulation by the provincial societies.—Rev. J. Scott Porter spoke warmly in behalf of Mr. Dall and

the Indian operations, and argued that schools were essential to any well-conceived missionary plan.—The suggestion for assisting the education (theological and scientific) of the Transylvanian Unitarian students was commended to the Association by Rev. J. J. Tayler, Mr. James Yates and Sir John Bowring, in speeches of much fervour. An instruction to the Committee, authorizing them to give immediate aid to the Klausenburg authorities in sending students to complete their education in England, was unanimously adopted.—The merits of the sermon of the day were well described by Rev. Thomas Madge, who moved the thanks of the meeting to Dr. Sadler.—Mr. James Heywood drew attention to a violation of religious liberty in respect to the Parliamentary franchise in the two Universities, and moved the adoption of a petition to the House of Commons, asking for a liberal extension of the franchise in the proposed Reform Bill, to include those who were now by conscientious scruples prevented signing the Thirty-nine Articles. The petition, being seconded by Professor Ed. Taylor, was adopted by the meeting.—Dr. Sadler paid an affectionate tribute to the memory of departed worthies, and moved a resolution commemorating the services of some who had been for years associated with the Institution.—The gentleman chosen to succeed Mr. Paget as President was Sir John Bowring, whose appointment was moved by Rev. E. Kell and seconded by Rev. J. Panton Ham.—The Vice-Presidents were then, on the motion of Rev. C. C. Coe, re-appointed, with the addition of the names of Mr. Charles Paget, M.P., Mr. H. A. Bright, of Liverpool, and Sir William A'Beckett.—To the list of Home Correspondents there were added the names of Rev. P. W. Clayden, of Nottingham, and Rev. Robert Spears, of Stockton. In place of the retiring members of the Committee, Rev. J. P. Malleson and Mr. E. Cobb were appointed.—On the motion of Mr. C. E. Whitehurst, seconded by Mr. J. Heywood, the subject of special religious services to the working classes was referred to the consideration of the Committee. The services of the several officers of the Association were acknowledged by a very cordial vote of thanks, proposed by Rev. W. J. Odgers and seconded by Rev. Edward Talbot.—The kindness of the ministers and trustees of Essex-Street chapel in receiving the Association was acknowledged by a vote proposed by Rev. Hugh Hutton. The chair was at the close of the meeting vacated by the President, and having been taken by the President-elect, a motion, proposed by Mr. James Heywood and seconded by Mr. J. C. Darbishire, of Rivington, was cordially adopted by the meeting, thanking Mr. Paget for the ability and kindness with which he had discharged the duties of President.—The members and friends of the Association then adjourned to the beautiful and spacious room in Arundel Street, the Whittington Hall, where a déjeuner was prepared. The party was sufficiently large to fill the room, and for several hours the proceedings were of a very animated and pleasing kind. The chair was ably filled by the President of the past year. The addresses were given by Rev. J. J. Tayler, Rev. J. Scott Porter, Rev. John Wright, Sir John Bowring, Rev. P. W. Clayden, Rev. R. Brook Aspland, Rev. William Mountford, now of America, Rev. Dr. Sadler, Rev. Brooke Herford. It is no small disappointment to us to find ourselves precluded from giving even an outline of the admirable speeches spoken on the occasion. When the last sentiment was given, one of respect and gratitude to the President, Mr. Paget said his year of office had familiarized him with the operations of the Society, and had given him the opportunity of seeing the steady application and judicious zeal of the Committee, and he desired to mark his sense of the value of their services, and of the claim they had on the confidence and support of the Unitarian body, by increasing his annual subscription from two to five guineas, and he hoped his example would be followed by others. Thus happily ended a meeting gratifying to all concerned from the regularity of the proceedings, and the unbroken harmony and earnestly zealous spirit by which all who took part were actuated. A new and brighter day has, we think, dawned on the Association and on the Unitarian body.

LONDON DISTRICT UNITARIAN SOCIETY.

The anniversary meeting was held on Thursday, May 31, at Radley's Hotel, and spite of heavy and unceasing rain, was, like all the preceding anniversary meetings, exceedingly well attended. The chair was taken by the President, James Yates, Esq., who was well supported by both laymen and ministers. The report of the Committee, read by Mr. J. C. Lawrence, detailed varied operations for promoting the Unitarian cause, by lectures at Islington and by religious services at Woolwich, where a promising mission has been established. An expression of regret at the discontinuance of the evening services at Portland-Street chapel called forth some strong feeling on that subject, and gave Rev. J. J. Tayler an opportunity of ex-

plaining his share in that transaction. The tone of the speeches was hopeful and cheering. We hope to atone for this brief notice of a very interesting meeting by recurring to the proceedings of the Society when we receive their annual Report in print.

UNITARIAN SUNDAY-SCHOOL ASSOCIATION.

The anniversary of this very useful Society,—always one of the great attractions of our Anniversary week,—was held on Thursday morning, May 31, at Radley's Hotel. In spite of continued rain, the company assembled on the occasion was so large, that one or two rooms in the hotel, in addition to the large room, were occupied at breakfast. After breakfast, all crowded into the large room, and were well rewarded by the addresses of the President, Sir John Bowring, the officers of the Society, and many of our principal laymen and ministers. An earnest appeal made by Rev. J. P. Ham to the members to take up some of the more neglected classes of society, made a deep impression, and the subject will be hereafter entertained by the Committee. We propose to notice their Report of the year's proceedings when it shall come before us in print.

WESTERN UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN UNION.

This meeting was celebrated at Bridport on May 23, and with the attractions of Sir John Bowring as President, Rev. W. H. Channing as preacher, and of Rev. Edward Higginson as the author of the Letter to the Churches, together with the admirable arrangements of Rev. J. L. Short and his friends at Bridport, proved a great success. If our space permitted, we could fill many columns with advantage with the report of the proceedings furnished to us. The speeches were earnest and eloquent, and breathed a spirit of catholic love. The Letter of Mr. Higginson has just reached us in print, and it well sustains the author's reputation for clear thought and bold utterance. We shall have an early opportunity in another department of our Magazine of speaking of this able and timely essay.

OBITUARY.

April 20, at Cambridge, Massachusetts, WILLIAM WELLS, Esq., aged 87. He was born at Bromsgrove, where his father, the Rev. W. Wells (a Daventry student), was minister. At the Birmingham riots in 1791, the meeting-house was threatened; and in 1793, his father emigrated to America, and received the degree of D.D. from Harvard College (Cambridge), and died at Brattleborough, where he was minister, at the advanced age of 83. (See Monthly Repository, 1828, p. 272.) Dr. Wells's family inherited his fidelity to principle and estimable qualities. The late Mr. William Wells was educated at Cambridge (Mass.), in which University he was afterwards a tutor. For many years, in connection with Mr. Lilly, he was a bookseller at Boston: this firm rendered good service to theology and classical literature by its importation of standard works, and also by reprints, among which may be mentioned a complete edition of Cicero's writings, the only one, we believe, published in America; and a reprint of the larger edition of Griesbach, in which they took the precedence of any English booksellers. In 1827, their shop and warehouse was consumed by fire, and Mr. Wells retired from business. He was highly esteemed as an elegant classical scholar, as well as a man of extensive reading. He made his attainments useful by opening a school, in which youths were prepared for college; and, for a short period in later life, he and Mrs. Wells received a few young ladies into their house as pupils. Though attached to the land of his adoption, he always took a deep interest in England: one of his sisters, Mrs. Freme, married a Liverpool merchant. When the writer of this notice enjoyed his hospitality, a few years ago, his energy and cheerful activity little indicated his advanced age. A paralytic stroke deprived him of the free use of his limbs a few months before his death; but he bore his trial with a wonderful sweetness and patience, the more striking and beautiful because less to be expected from one whose long-continued health and active habits would make him feel entire dependence on others more painfully. He expressed his feelings of perfect faith and trust, and said that he had no fear or anxiety in looking forward. To the last he enjoyed hearing reading and the conversation of his friends. His peaceful end was in keeping with his peaceful life. Tributes to his memory appeared in the Boston papers; and the Christian

Register contained most of the funeral sermon by his son-in-law, Dr. Newell, the respected minister of the First Church in Cambridge.

April 26, in Dublin, at the house of her brother, W. S. Gray, Esq., Mrs. ELIZABETH R. STEPHENS, aged 65 years.

May 10, at his residence, Beech Grove, Leeds, THOMAS WILLIAM TOTTIE, Esq., aged 87.

May 16, in Gloucester, after a long illness, Mr. GEORGE WASHBOURNE, mercer, in the 61st year of his age.

May 26, at his house, Brook Bank, Godley, in the county of Chester, in the 58th year of his age, Mr. JOSEPH HIBBERT. Deprived by an accident in youth of an arm, he devoted himself to the profession of the law, as that in which his loss of limb would occasion the least inconvenience. He established a respectable and lucrative practice in Hyde, and by his integrity and assiduity had at a comparatively early period secured to himself a large amount of confidence and respect. He combined with professional pursuits a taste for literature, and made some unambitious essays both in poetry and antiquarian topography. A lecture which he prepared for a local institution, descriptive of Hyde and its surrounding district, and which being published reached a second edition, was a creditable specimen of his literary taste and topographical knowledge. He, together with all the sons of his father (the late Mr. Randal Hibbert, of Brookside), was an unhesitating and consistent supporter of liberal politics. His religious convictions were decidedly Unitarian, and he always took a deep interest in the services and prosperity of the Gee-Cross chapel. In the intercourses of private life he was remarkable for simplicity of manners, good-nature and kind feeling. He leaves a widow and large family, who, together with a not small circle of friends, lament with chastened sorrow their separation from a deservedly and tenderly loved relative.

May 27, at the house of her sister-in-law, Miss Davis, Chowbent, aged 47 years, MARTHA, wife of Mr. William DAVIS, of Manchester, the youngest son of the late Rev. B. R. Davis, for many years the Unitarian minister of the former place.

May 28, aged 38 years, JANE GRANT, wife of Samuel GRUNDY, Esq., Bridge Hall, Bury.

June 8, in her second year, after three days' illness, MARY COGAN, the beloved child of Edward and Bithia FILLITER, Hyde-Park Place, Headingley, Leeds.

MARRIAGES.

March 31, at the residence of Mr. S. T. Holmes, Angas Street, Adelaide, South Australia, by Rev. J. Crawford Woods, B.A., JOHN HENRY FRETWELL, surgeon-dentist, to MARY ELIZABETH, third daughter of Mr. Henry GIBBENS, all of Adelaide.

June 1, at the Octagon chapel, Norwich, Mr. EDWARD HEWITT to Miss HANNAH REEVE.

June 2, at Bank-Street chapel, Bolton, by Rev. Franklin Baker, M. A., Mr. GEO. ORRELL to ELIZABETH, daughter of the late Mr. James HOWARTH, both of Bolton.

June 4, at Bank-Street chapel, Bolton, by Rev. Franklin Baker, M. A., Mr. JOS. LOWE to MARY, daughter of the late Mr. John WALSH, both of Turton.

June 7, at the Newington-Green chapel, by Rev. Dr. Cromwell, Mr. FREDERICK *WILLIAM* TURNER, of Stoke Newington, to MELINA, daughter of Andrew PRITCHARD, Esq., of Canonbury.

June 8, at Lewin's-Mead chapel, Bristol, by Rev. William James, Mr. JOHN STAPLES to CAROLINE JANE, only daughter of Mr. John LEWIS, both of Bristol.

June 11, at the Unitarian church, Newhall Hill, Birmingham, by Mr. J. Green, Mr. ROBERT JAMES BAILEY, Winson Green, to ESTHER EMBREY, Lodge Road.

June 12, at the Unitarian church, Swansea, by Rev. Edward Higginson, JOHN LEWIS, fourth son of Mr. Edward COTTON, of Rochester, Kent, to HANNAH JANE, eldest daughter of the late Mr. Daniel DAVIES, of Castle Square, Swansea.

June 20, at the Unitarian chapel, Sunderland, by the father of the bridegroom, JOHN RICHARD, only son of the Rev. John OWEN, of Lydgate, to ELLEN ADAMS, second daughter of Mr. John WRIGHT, of Sunderland.

THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CLXXXVIII.] AUGUST 1860 [Vol. XVI

ADDRESS TO THE STUDENTS OF MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE, LONDON. DELIVERED AFTER THE ANNUAL EXAMINATION ON JUNE 27, 1860, BY THE REV. WILLIAM GASKELL, M.A., AS ONE OF THE VISITORS.

GENTLEMEN,—At the close of an Examination such as we have just gone through, I feel that you can scarcely be in a condition to attend to aught in the shape of a formal dissertation, and I should be going beyond my sphere, if I were to single out for remark any of the studies that are carried on here, and which, as you have proved, are in excellent hands. But I may hope that you will listen to me while I offer a few suggestions respecting the position which you are destined to occupy, looking at it from the vantage-ground of a wider experience than your own. On this alone rests my claim to address you. Having dwelt as yet, for the most part, in "a calm and pleasing solitariness, fed with cheerful and confident thoughts"—"beholding the bright countenance of truth in the quiet and still air of delightful studies"—you cannot see so clearly what awaits you, when you come "to embark in a troubled sea of noises and hoarse disputes," as those who have long been tossed upon it, and cannot, therefore, know so well what are the requisites for a safe and successful voyage over it.

First of all, let me say, distinctly and emphatically, that you will not do yourselves justice, nor the cause which you are to serve, if you yield in any wise to the feeling sometimes expressed, which would lower the demand for true scholarship amongst us. There is, I grant, a field of labour now opening to us that may not call for the same high mental culture as those in which we have hitherto been mainly engaged—though even in it, I am persuaded, if there be the right spirit, such culture will be found not a hindrance but a help, "not waste but a good work;" but it is the special duty of another Institution to send forth labourers into that field, as it is of this to prepare you for one where more extensive learning and varied accomplishments are needed. Not to dwell on the obvious gain to yourselves, and the increased power of influencing others for good, which knowledge will be sure to confer, if it is used to mature your judgment and reflection, and make you not merely learned men but men improved

by learning—you will frequently be placed in circumstances where you will be glad that you are able to summon this directly to your aid. For example, you will find that questions are now exciting an interest, and freely discussed, among our thoughtful laity, which demand no slight and superficial acquaintance with theology on the part of those who would take up and maintain a clear, independent position with regard to them. The deference once paid to professional assertions is gone, and if you would be listened to now, it must be for the reasons you bring. You will sometimes feel a dark and heavy atmosphere of doubt around you, and at other times the thick and stifling mists of educated superstition, which nothing but the vivid flashes of a piercing intelligence can dissipate. And occasionally you will be brought in contact with a subtle and refined scepticism which, in its attacks on faith, substitutes, for the old method of direct assault, the more dangerous one of sap and mine, and which it needs all the resources of moral and religious truth to encounter. In these, and such-like cases, those to whom you stand in the relation of teachers will naturally, and justly, expect that you should be prepared to furnish them with information and opinions on which they may rely, and help them to keep the strength of their souls intact.—You know little, either, of what is taking place in other Churches—of the kind of questions which are agitating them, and the changes they are undergoing—if you do not perceive how necessary it is, unless we are content to lose the post of honour which we have hitherto held in the vanguard of a free theology, that those who are to lead our ranks should be men cased in the armour of proof and equipped with the high-tempered weapons which generous scholarship supplies. It is because we have had such leaders that our little band has exerted, and is still exerting, an influence so confessedly beyond what its numbers would have entitled it to expect. Be worthy to tread in the steps of those leaders, and "guard the laurels that descend to you." It is too likely that cases will arise in which you may be called upon, as they have been, by your allegiance to sacred truth, to withstand the pretensions of High-Church authority, or expose the mistakes of Dissenting infallibility (such as that which lately gave to the mediæval doctrine of justification by faith the prestige of antiquity, from confounding the Confession of Augsburg with the Confessions of Augustine), and where, without the aids and appliances of learning, you may disgrace the cause which you have to defend. If you are not able to compete, in nicety of classical knowledge or extent of mathematical attainments, with those who "walk the studious cloisters pale" on the banks of the Isis and the Cam, you may, I am convinced, make yourselves masters of what is really important in their acquisitions, and at the same time surpass the generality in such subjects as biblical criticism and interpretation, the history of

the Church and its doctrines, the philosophy of human nature and its connection with religion. You have one advantage here which is often denied to other students,—you can pursue your inquiries with perfect freedom, unchecked by any irreligious fear that true science can ever reveal aught the least at variance with God's true word.—Imagine not, then, though you may be unable yet to see clearly its use, that you can dispense with any part of the discipline provided for you here. Do you who are still passing through it, strive to make the very utmost of it. Seek to form your minds at once to those patient and discriminating habits of thought, which will soon be needed in actual service, to separate the wheat from the chaff, the true from the false; and "give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine, that your profiting may appear to all." And do not you, who are now going from under the special control and supervision of others to play your individual part in the world, think for a moment that your studies are at an end, but only feel that from this time forth you are made responsible to yourselves for your improvement, and that by your own efforts the mental habits in which you have been trained must be continued, and your mental wants be supplied. Labour still to extend and brighten your knowledge, to enrich and ennoble your minds, and shew yourselves more and more "workmen that need not to be ashamed."

Let me say a word, next, on the call which you will find for definite views of Christian doctrine. Many may over-estimate the importance of this, but others, to my apprehension, underestimate it. The way in which some speak of opinions, as though all were of about the same value and entitled to the same reverence, indicates, to my mind, the want of a lively regard for any. It is pretty much as if a physician were to deem it of no consequence whether the ingredients of his medicines were pure or adulterated. You cannot, I am convinced, divorce practical wisdom altogether from speculative truth. An idea, before now, has moulded a life. The views which a man takes of God, in proportion as they are sincere, must have a formative influence on his character. If in the highest object of his reverence he sees a stern, pitiless, vengeful taskmaster, you can hardly expect that he himself will be found mild, gentle and easy-to-be-entreated. I have had distinct proof, too, in my own experience, how deleterious the effects may be of a faith which has not reason and conscience for its kin, both in bewildering the mind and perverting the heart; and I am likewise persuaded, that to this source may be traced no small amount of the scepticism which lies smouldering in the bosom of society. In a matter, therefore, of such importance as I cannot but regard this, it seems to me most desirable that, before you come out into the world, you should try to attain to something like clear and satisfactory conclusions concerning the great doctrines of Christian faith, so

that you may not be perpetually see-sawing between two sets of opinions. I am not recommending you to *make up* your minds, in anything like a narrow and contracted spirit, leaving no openings for new truth to enter. Far from it. Be ready always to welcome this, let it break from whatever quarter it may. Look for daily light, as you look for daily bread. Correct, and brighten, and enlarge your views by constant study. Interrogate nature, providence, revelation—interrogate philosophy, literature, science—interrogate every oracle by which the responses of a present Deity may be obtained; but be not "ever learning, and never coming to a knowledge of the truth." Surely, it is possible to have definite opinions, without reducing them to a petrifaction—steady convictions, without resisting all change. One of your duties is to be "the manifestation of the truth;" but how can you manifest that which you do not possess? If the light trembles and is confused in your own mind, how can you hope to reflect it clearly into the minds of others? You are to "prove all things," no doubt; but there is a "good" which you are to "hold fast," if you would offer it to your fellow-men. You cannot reach, it is true, that unerring certainty which will qualify you to become authorities before which they are to bow; but you may arrive at conclusions that are satisfactory to yourselves, and which, in a spirit of meekness and love, you may recommend to them. The most earnest faith need never lessen, in the slightest degree, either your humility or your charity.—From our having no creed, an impression widely prevails that we have no clear and settled belief. An unfriendly critic attributes to this cause what he supposes to be our declining state and want of influence. "Its simplicity," he says, "might give Unitarian preaching a great advantage, but its vagueness and unfixedness ever has been, and must always be, its ruin." *Fas est et ab hoste doceri.* If too much ground may have been afforded for his "ever has been," I see none for his "must always be." Why should not you have your definite convictions—your truth—as well as other men; and why should not you be equally faithful in bearing witness to it?

Again; let me say it is of the utmost importance that you should maintain a deep sense of the real greatness of your work. This will be a powerful stimulus to you in preparing for it, and a needful support in carrying it on. It is to be your business to speak to your fellow-men on the highest themes which can claim their attention—to minister to their spiritual wants—to bring order out of disorder, change vice into virtue, sin into holiness—to feed and nurture those diviner elements of the soul which enable it to conquer the worst evils of life, and triumph over death, and raise it to a companionship with the angels of God. If you do not feel how much nobler a thing it is to be labouring truly in a work like this—the work of the Saviour—

than to be most successfully engaged in heaping up riches, or securing any of the ordinary objects of ambition—I must honestly tell you, you have mistaken your vocation; you have no call to your calling; you will fail, and deserve to fail. This, I know, is the feeling sought to be cherished in you here. The true standard is kept before you. But when you come forth to your actual work, you will find things tried by a very different one. You will have to mix with men to whom wealth is one of the highest powers, and who treat the interests with which you have to do as trifling and unreal, compared with those in which they are engaged. And there is a danger to you in this, against which you must be upon your guard. The breath they breathe may dim your true ideal. You may let yourselves, almost unconsciously, be warped by the influences around you, and the false glitter of the earthly mammon dull your sense of the incomparable brightness of the treasure in heaven, and the small hopes and fears which gather round the perishing obscure to you the grandeur of those which belong to the eternal. In this case, your work will not be true work. There will be an element of weakness in it; and it may become only poor, heartless, irksome task-work. You will not respect it yourselves, and how can you hope that it will be respected by others? But if you keep before you what the real nature of your ministry is—that it is yours to confer something better than food, or money, or health, or knowledge—yours to make everlasting impressions for good; and, at the same time, cherish the faith that God is with you as He was with the prophets and apostles of earlier times, and with the saints and martyrs of later days, as interested in your work as He was in theirs, and as ready to strengthen and uphold you in it,—then you will run no risk of proving faithless to it. Your soul will keep its state in a calm, clear region, whence it can look forth and see things in something like their true proportions, and the mere pomp and pageantry of this transient life will fade away into their actual insignificance.—This is a point to which I attach no slight importance. Make it your fixed and settled faith—let there be no flaw of doubt in it—that grander and nobler work than that which you have chosen, earth has, and can have, none. Begin at once to mould your lives by this faith, and let your souls become so pervaded with it that its influence may be felt, animating and quickening you, in all that you do. This will not render you vain and conceited. You need not despise other men's work, because you honour your own. You may magnify your office, without magnifying yourselves. Nay, the very sense of its greatness—while inspiring you with calm courage and generous devotion, and schooling you to patient labour and cheerful self-sacrifice—will tend to keep you humble. You will feel how little able you are to rise to the height of it, and be made anxious to become more and more equal to it.

Such a sense will lead, almost of necessity, to earnestness in your pulpit ministrations; but this is a requisite so important that I cannot pass it by without distinct notice. The call for it may have degenerated into something like cant, but there is a reality at the bottom of it which is worth attending to. Apathy and indifference, you may be perfectly sure, win no triumphs here, any more than anywhere else. In no case is the rule of effective oratory so true as in this,—if you would move others, you must first be moved yourself; speak not because you must say something, but because you have something to say. It is yours to offer the word of life to the souls that are under your care, but if it is a dead word to your own souls, you will never offer it in such a way as to quicken and vivify theirs. Men soon detect, by a sort of instinct, the difference between him who speaks because he has a post to fill, a party to serve, a living to gain, and him who speaks because he has a conviction to utter, a truth to impart. The former may have the art to dress up his discourse with tact and skill, but all his power will only make it flash with the cold light that "plays round the head, but comes not to the heart;" while the latter, with far less ability perchance, will be sure to find a response there, because what he says springs out of the intensity of feeling in his own. This has been the case with all who have mightily moved others. It was so with the first preachers of Christianity; and, as far as human agency went, this was the great secret of their success. They were thoroughly convinced themselves, and therefore they convinced others. They were altogether in earnest, and therefore they made a deep impression on the world. They spoke with the tone and authority of faith, and therefore men listened with the deference of disciples. They could say without any hesitation, "We believe, and therefore speak."—It was so with the great leaders of the Reformation. They spoke with such marvellous effect, because they had so fervently embraced their object.—It was so with Whitfield and Wesley. They felt that they were called to do a great work in the revival of the religious life, more especially among the poor and world-neglected. They gave themselves to it, heart and soul. And we know the result. The ignorant were roused to consideration, the profligate reclaimed to virtue, the brutal and besotted won over to piety and goodness.—And so will it be with you. Speak with the force of living conviction—because there is a burden on your souls which you must discharge, a message of God which you must deliver—and then you will find what has been done in the past may be done in the present. If you have that kindling earnestness which is born of clear faith in great principles, success must be yours. Spirit will call unto spirit in tones which it cannot resist, and men be forced to bear witness to the moving words that proceed *out of* your mouth. You may, it is true, be without some helps

which other preachers possess. You will have none of the artificial sanctity of a priesthood to impart influence to your teaching. You will not be able to make any pretensions to apostolical succession, in order to lend authority to what you say. You will have no cloak of church infallibility to throw over your deficiencies. You must carry your commission in your fitness for your work. It must be the weight of your own character which gives you weight. But you have one great advantage above many. You will have no burden of subscription to articles on your conscience, to tempt you to insincerity. You will not be forced to adjust your convictions to some old traditional creed, from which the life has long since departed. It will be your privilege, and esteem it not lightly, to speak out of the fulness of your own mind and heart the things pertaining to man's deepest wants. You will not be obliged to pass your truth through the channels which church authorities approve, and cautiously serve it out in the standard measures which they supply; but you will be free to present it drawn straight from those freshly-springing fountains which God has opened, according to every one's need.

In doing this, there is one point which, I am sure, deserves your attention. If you are to act on men's characters—to make them love virtue and loathe vice, be true and noble instead of false and mean, generous Christians instead of selfish worldlings —you must be able to move them deeply, and this can be done only through their emotional nature. Mere reasoning will never do it. The feelings and sympathies must be engaged; the heart go along with the head. It is the fervent call of the prophet spirit, and not the cold voice of instruction, which rouses men from their slumbers, and kindles them to high action, and braces them up for brave endurance. This is a consideration which, it seems to me, we have too much lost sight of. We can lay claim to minds of wide research, and great intelligence and refinement; but where shall we look for the tenderness that melts and sways the heart at will; where for the eloquence that carries the soul along with it; where for the thunderbolts that transfix the guilty; where for the influence that descends as softly as dew, as silently as light, and as transforming and efficacious? Let us be honest; —have not the sensibilities been too little cultivated amongst us, the heroic elements been too much overlooked? Has not too exclusive attention been paid to the intellect; and have not the capabilities of our principles for impression been undervalued? It is this, I believe, which has done much to alienate from us men of warm, poetic temperaments, and unfitted our views for popular sympathy and acceptance. An improvement in this respect is undoubtedly taking place, and the results are most encouraging.—As you wish, then, to influence men for good, see that the truths which you have to offer them are not suffered to dwindle into logical forms, or intellectual abstractions, or meta-

physical speculations; but bring them forth steeped in the vital warmth of your own inmost heart. You may not, perchance, have the vivid nature which forms the orator almost without effort; but you may have, and should have, the fervour of feeling which naturally runs into poetic expression, and pours itself forth in words of strong and stirring meaning, and which will go far to render you eloquent.

One other point briefly, and I have done. I am inclined to think that there has scarcely been sufficient freedom in our public ministrations, and that we might take a lesson from the first promulgators of Christianity. Preaching was not then the formal thing it has since become, but, as you know, a free and diversified agency. Sometimes in the market-place, sometimes in the private dwelling, or any place that offered, the gospel was preached. And the manner was equally varied. The early preachers endeavoured to be all things to all men, so that they might by all means save some. The methods of Christian influence had not then hardened into unbending forms, but there was an elasticity about them which contrasts strongly with our own rigid modes. And I much doubt whether the gain is with us. I have no wish that the pulpit should be deprived of its fitting solemnity, but we must see that this becomes not devout dulness, and that the end is not sacrificed to the means. The object to be aimed at is to render religion attractive, interesting and impressive; and there is one method of doing this which, I am convinced, we have not yet sufficiently turned to account. We must all have felt the advantage, in keeping up attention and reaching the heart, which is possessed over a written discourse by a forcible, feeling extempore address; and if so, why should not we, as well as other denominations, avail ourselves of this form of preaching? I can only say, if my own course had to come over again, I would cultivate it with the most sedulous care. There need be in it no slovenliness, no want of thought, or accuracy, or arrangement; and, as experience shews, it may be the means of interesting those with whom the ordinary method very often fails. Is it not desirable, then, that you should acquire a readiness in this way of giving utterance to your thoughts? Many are the occasions now which call for it, and in which you will find your power of usefulness lessened by the want of it; and these will increase with the extension of the missionary spirit which has recently manifested itself amongst us, and which, in my opinion, promises most important results.

The remarks which I now bring to a close are somewhat desultory and unconnected, I know. I care not for that, if they only lead you to contemplate at all more steadily the work which is before you, and to see at all more clearly what are the demands which it will make upon you. As you may easily suppose, we who are soon to quit the stage cannot but look with no little

interest and anxiety on you, into whose hands we are about to commit the cause which we have laboured for and loved, and on whose fidelity its future success must needs so greatly depend. We believe that it demands, and deserves, the consecration to it of an undivided heart and undivided life. If you do not feel this, and are not prepared to devote to it every power and every energy which God has given you, you are not worthy of it. If you do feel this, and are ready to spend and be spent in its service—to work honestly and faithfully for its promotion, earnest yet not hasty, resolute yet not rash, calm yet not indolent, hopeful yet not impatient, watching and waiting day by day for the calls which it makes upon you—then your reward is sure; you will find your hands continually growing stronger, and difficulties giving way before you, and have many witnesses to your success here, and a higher witness above.

SEA WEEDS.

BY R. E. B. MACLELLAN.

FROM hedge-row green we do not come,
Or shadowy wood, or sunny lea,
Or breezy hill,—but have our home
Far down beneath the dark blue sea.
Cradled by wind and rocked by storm,
Yet grace and beauty both are ours;
Nor yield we, in our hue or form,
E'en to the proud earth's fairest flowers.

Ours are the ocean's forests vast,
And ours the ocean's gardens fair,
Where pearls are 'mid the foliage cast,
And living creatures bright and rare
Through all our shelly caverns roam,
Or sink amid our bowers to rest,
And feel within their briny home
That not the land alone is blest.

No gloom pervades our dwelling-place,
For moon and star they both shine clear,
But with a soft and chastened grace,
Down through our wavy atmosphere.
But most the great sun's mighty glow
Does all our depths with gladness fill:
Our humblest homes are not so low,
But Heaven's bright smile can reach them still!

NEGLECTED BIOGRAPHY. No. I.

SOME ACCOUNT OF THE WRITINGS, CORRESPONDENCE AND PERSECUTION OF REV. SAMUEL BOLD, RECTOR OF STEEPLE, IN THE COUNTY OF DORSET.

If any one, properly qualified for the difficult task, were to compile a volume of "Neglected Biography," the life of Samuel Bold, a defender and personal friend of John Locke, and the able and fearless champion of religious liberty at a time when its enemies were numerous and unsparing, would probably find a place therein. Having searched in vain for any particular account of this excellent clergyman, we have been induced to put together such particulars of his life and writings as, after a careful search in some of the principal libraries of Oxford and London, we have been able to glean concerning him, in the hope of interesting at least a portion of our readers, and rescuing from forgetfulness the memory of a man of more than common worth and talent. If, notwithstanding some pains in the search, our narrative seems scanty, the facts that the subject of our memoir outlived all his early contemporaries, and that nearly a century and a quarter have elapsed since his death, must serve as our apology.

Samuel Bold was born in the year 1649, in or near the ancient city of Chester. Of his parents nothing is known; but it is probable that he was at a very early period of life deprived of them, for he gratefully acknowledges in the preface of one of his books* generally the "great love" shewn to him by his friends in the city of Chester from his infancy upwards, and more particularly the "motherly affection, care and tenderness" manifested towards him through "childhood and youth" by one Christian lady residing in that city.

Among the worthies of Chester, none shewed greater religiousness of spirit or more disinterested charity than William Cooke, the ejected minister of St. Michael, and one of the chief founders of that Protestant Nonconformity which was subsequently adorned by Matthew Henry and others. The description which Baxter and Calamy give of him sets before us a Puritan "of the primitive stamp," "who could go in poor clothing, live on a little, travel on foot," and preach and pray all the week through, when and where he could get a few to hear him. This good man and his wife, having no family, were accustomed to adopt children, providing for them food, lodging, raiment, and, above all, careful and systematic instruction in religion and human learning, fitting them for the ministry. Samuel Bold was one of those thus trained. Mr. Cooke was an accomplished oriental scholar, and known as such to Bishop Walton, the editor of the Polyglot Bible, who, if he could, would have gladly induced him

* "Man's Great Duty," London, 12mo, 1693.

to conform. Mr. Bold was with him, probably, in the relations of adopted son and pupil at the time of his ejectment, and when, shortly after, at the instigation of Bishop Hall, he was thrown into prison by the mayor for preaching in his own house. This incident would teach him the hideous character of religious persecution. Harshly as Mr. Cooke was treated, he continued to exhibit a catholic spirit, which would contrast all the more with the uncharitableness which made him a sufferer. "He managed his dissent from Conformists with that candour and Christian temper, he highly deserved love and respect from all Conformists who were endowed with true piety, or indeed had any share of common ingenuity. He did not abuse his Dissent to uncharitableness and censure; nay, he could not endure to hear a deserving Conformist reflected on."

Through what influences or by what means Mr. Bold sought and obtained ordination, we are not informed. Together with the other members of the family of Mr. Cooke, he was accustomed always to attend the services of the Church. Possibly through the influence and aid of Bishop Wilkins (whose forbearance and mildness sapped the Nonconformity of several in the diocese of Chester), he might receive ordination as a priest of the Established Church. The first preferment with which we find his name connected was the vicarage of Shapwick, in the county of Dorset. He was instituted to this benefice, returned in 1650 as yielding £80 per annum, in 1674, when he was thirty years of age. Here his duties were confined to a small and simple flock; but he was earnest in his efforts to instruct and improve them. It was his custom to preach every Sunday on the prescribed Epistle for the day, either as a whole or on some chosen part of it. In March 1682, he was called upon to read the brief in behalf of the persecuted Protestants in France. The Epistle appointed for the day (March 26) was Gal. iv. Finding in that chapter the words, "But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the spirit, even so it is now," he selected them as a text and preached from them a sermon against Persecution. He was entitled to say that he discoursed on his text "with a freedom which becomes a Christian, and particularly a true son of the Church of England." He spoke of the repulsive and abominable characteristics of persecution and its abettors with equal plainness and force. Here is a passage:

"Christ and religion do not allow of persecutions, of troubling and vexing, of ruining and undoing any man for little indifferences, much less for truth and holyness. They are for advancing and propagating holyness, and peace, and love, and condescension. Christ came not to destroy but to save men's lives, and sharply rebukes his disciples when they would have call'd for fire from heaven to destroy the Samaritans. It is a sure token men are enemies to Christ and religion when they are

of a persecuting spirit. It hath always been the great character and glory of the Christian religion, that where ever it came it did promote and further quietness, and peace, and love, and brotherly kindness; and did banish wrath, and fury, and malice, and every hateful and hurtful disposition and inclination. It was always thus, till Popery got some power in the world, and then more barbarous villanies and outragious cruelties were perpetrated under this name than were known to the world before. And if it be carefully observed, you shall find that in all ages those who have been most for cruel methods against them that differ from them, have had most of the spirit of Popery in them; and it is deplorably apparent that now in our days they who appear most vigorous and active in prosecuting those Protestants who differ from others in some accidental matters, have a great affection for Popery, and are hastening towards Rome as fast as they can."

The portrait which Mr. Bold draws of the men by whose agency the persecuting laws of those evil days were enforced, would seem a caricature, did not the lives of some of the sufferers which have come down to us confirm his accuracy.

"They that never scruple to tear the name of God in pieces, and to affront their Maker on every turn by taking his name in vain, who emboss every word they speak with some dreadful oath or other, who dare impudently swear a hundred oaths in an hour, without any provocation,—these are the fittest men to inform and swear against, and indeavour their ruine, who have a religious and truly conscientious regard to the name of God, and every thing on which he hath stampt his image."

In describing the evil influences which have inflamed persecution, Mr. Bold mentions unjust prejudices, eagerly imbibed and fondly entertained; and he chastises with his equal censure Churchmen and Dissenters who had "disported themselves" into excessive wrath and mutual enmity. Thus does Mr. Bold expose the inconsistency of the Popish party in the Church in their behaviour to the Church of Rome and their treatment of Nonconformists:

"How ridiculous and absurd is it, to hear men talk very gravely at sometimes, that the Church hath no weapons but tears and prayers, and yet presently to see the same men using rods, and swords, and axes, in the Church's behalf! When the Church is in danger of being clouded, eclypsed, and overcome, and suppresst by Popery, then it is unlawful to endeavour to help our selves; we must only lie prostrate, and try if we can wash away our sorrow with our tears, or at most content our selves with, *Lord, help us!* But when we consider them we have got an ascendancy over, it becomes glorious (and indeed is more than Christian) to swagger and triumph, and tread upon men of the same religion with our selves, only because they differ from us in some unhappy circumstances.

"When the Church doth stand upon its proper basis, and shines in its native beauty and lustre, there will be no *hurting in God's holy mountain.*

"That method which hath most of lenity, forbearance, love, and meekness, doth best comport with the nature and design of Christianity, and

most answers that temper our Saviour and his apostles commended to the world both by their practices and precepts. Luke ix. 55; 2 Tim. ii. 24."

Applying his general principles of toleration and forbearance to the then state of parties in England, and referring to a pacific and healing resolution passed by the House of Commons, Jan. 10, 1680, which he pronounces consonant with the declaration of the King at Breda, he says,

"The prosecution of these laws hath been declared inconvenient and hurtful to the Protestant religion, by them who understand the nature, the tendency, and the obligation of these laws, as well or better than any of the violent and outragious prosecutors of them. And tho' this cannot repeal or make null the laws, yet the publick opinion of so great, honourable, and august an assembly, should have so much influence as to check the inordinate zeal some are too apt to lay out in their unnecessary informations and presentments."

Could the impolicy of persecution as a means of conversion be better shewn than in these words?

"Suppose you should force many to come within the door of our churches by harsh and severe proceedings, what is our Church the better for this? Can you, together with outward compulsion, infuse into their minds an affectionate love to, and unfeigned approbation of our service and worship? If not, you may make our Church fuller of hypocrites than she was before, but not fuller of real and cordial proselytes; you may turn the places for our publick worship into prisons, if you please, but you cannot by these means make the Dissenters *a willing people in the day of your power.*

"The members of the Church must be volunteers, and not press'd men. Such as are forced will never do acceptable service: they will embrace the first opportunity to relinquish and bespatter us."

To preach a sermon like this was a bold act at a time when, as Lord Macaulay has expressed it, "a series of odious acts" had been passed by Parliament; when the magistrates by whom these rigorous statutes were to be enforced were in general men inflamed by party spirit; and when the gaols were filled with Dissenters, and "among the sufferers were some of whose genius and virtue any Christian society might well be proud." But to publish such a sermon was to declare war against the hierarchy of the day, and to expose himself to the bitter anger of his neighbours of the rural clergy, a class of men "more vehement in Toryism than the rural gentry." The mere preaching of such a sermon to the few peasants of Dorsetshire accustomed to assemble themselves in the parish church of Shapwick, roused many "false reports." The preacher vainly thought he could by its publication check the excitement and call "violent and headstrong men" to "consideration." The Address to the Reader with which it was ushered in to the world did not mend matters. Imagine the indignation of rural squires and clergymen over their tankards of ale when they read this tribute to the character of Dissenters!

"Those of the Dissenters whom I have been acquainted with have been men of great learning, exemplary piety, strict devotion, and extraordinary loyalty. Men who have been diligent attenders on God in his publick ordinances, eminently religious in their families, who have had a great regard to conscience in all the parts of their conversation with men. . . . . They have been persons that could not be justly blamed for any thing, but that they had straighter notions concerning humane impositions in the service of God than we Conformists have."

It was an unfortunate circumstance for Mr. Bold that his ecclesiastical superior was Dr. William Gulston, the Bishop of Bristol, a man equally mean in character and talents; one who fawned on those above him and regained his self-respect by severity against those beneath him; who affected an inordinate zeal for his Church, which his actions belied, and who, giving out his intention of permanently enriching the see of Bristol by endowing it with his family living of Symondsbury (near Bridport), was enabled to hold his rectory after his elevation to the episcopal bench, and then failed to fulfil his part of the compact. In such a man there were all the elements needed to make an unflinching persecutor. There exist damning proofs against him in this particular in his own autograph letters to Archbishop Sheldon, which form part of the invaluable series of MSS. collected by Bishop Tanner and deposited in the Bodleian Library. We are not aware that these letters have ever been published, and we shall presently give extracts from them so far as they illustrate the history of Mr. Bold.

At the assizes held at Sherborne, Aug. 1682, the grand jury (at whose instigation we shall presently shew) expressed their desire that the King should be informed that the peace of the county was much secured by the vigorous enforcement of the penal laws against Popish recusants and all other Dissenters, and they then proceed upon the information of John Ouctalony, clerk, of Beer-Regis, to present Samuel Bold for the publication of a seditious pamphlet, entitled "A Sermon against Persecution," whereby the King's government was defamed. How Mr. Bold met this presentment and the indictment founded on it will be presently seen in his own words. Before he defended himself against the legal charge, he pleaded at the bar of public opinion in self-defence by the publication of a 4to pamphlet of 42 pages, entitled, "A Plea for Moderation towards Dissenters, occasioned by the Grand Juries presenting the Sermon against Persecution, &c. To which is added an Answer to the Objections commonly made against that Sermon."

One of the mottoes on the title-page is a passage from the Stratagems of Satan by Acontius *(Qui pacem et concordiam in Ecclesiâ vult esse, oportet eum rerum necessariarum confessione contentum esse)*, which indicates the author's desire to limit the confession and creed of his Church to matters absolutely neces-

sary. He accordingly argues in the outset, that to force others to comply in the use of needless rites by resorting to penalties is the work, not of God, but of Satan (p. 3). He then proceeds to argue that moderation is the true policy and greatest safeguard of the Church of England. To shew the propriety of enforcing things indifferent on other men's consciences, he appeals to the conduct of the first preachers of Christianity. He pleads for moderation towards Dissenters on the authority of such men as Bishop Wilkins and Dr. Tillotson. The eulogium on the former is worthy of being extracted.

"It is very well known that Dr. Wilkins, late Bishop of Chester, was a man of as prodigious universal learning, and of as clear and solid a judgment, as any man the Christian world was ever adorned with; and it is as well known that he was equally famous for his moderation towards Dissenters before he was made Bishop, as for any of his other extraordinary accomplishments: and after he ascended the episcopal seat he continued the same man he was before, and made that diocess (as it is very well known there, and in most other places) the most flourishing and truly religious part (I think I may truly say) of all Christendom, by the happy influence, under Divine grace, his eminent moderation, zealous piety, and most Christian government had in those parts."

The question is argued from the beginning on large and general principles, and the author proceeds steadily to his conclusion by the approved and now all but universally recognized arguments for religious liberty, and against persecution in all forms and degrees. Referring to the opinion hostile to his sermon expressed by several of eminent places in the Church, he remarks, "For my own part, I do not much concern myself for that. With me it is a small thing to be judged of man's judgment. I am willing to pay every man the respect his particular place, character, office and quality can require. But I hope it is no fault for a man to wish and pray that the Church of England may never sink, perish—no, nor suffer, by the false and insidious tricks of some who pretend to her. 'Tis not the opposition of enemies on all hands that can do us so much hurt as the scandal and folly of pretending friends."*

The "Plea for Moderation" is throughout calm and able, and is probably the best of the various works written by its excellent author. The publication of it, instead of mitigating, increased the rancour of the author's enemies, and the "Plea" was, as well as the Sermon, made the groundwork of a prosecution in both the civil and ecclesiastical courts. But if Mr. Bold had his enemies, he was not without friends, and from one of them (Mr. William Churchill) he received, about the time of the hostile proceedings against him for his Sermon, institution to the rectory of Steeple, in the island of Purbeck, a living superior in

* Bishop Wilkins' Sermon, p. 162.

value to Shapwick. This, again, was a very thinly-peopled parish. The church, like that from which his early friend Mr. Cooke had been ejected, was dedicated to St. Michael. Of the legal proceedings against Mr. Bold we have an account published by him nearly forty years after the events. Slightly abbreviated, it will be read with interest.

"The turn and course of affairs in this land in the years 1687-8 were such as produced an almost universal acknowledgment that that sort of people who were so vehemently offended with the Sermon against Persecution and the Plea for Moderation towards Dissenters, which I published in the year 1682, had been Popish tools." Mr. Bold then alludes to the revival of the talk against him on the part both of the laity and clergy, as if the hostile proceedings both in the ecclesiastical court and at the assizes were justifiable, and feels himself called upon, after a long forbearance, to lay before the world a plain narrative of matters of fact. The time and occasion of the Sermon, and the reason for publishing the "Plea for Moderation," are referred to as explained in these publications.

"The next assize after the Sermon was published, the grand jury presented me for that Sermon. I was afterwards indicted for it. The same method was taken with respect to my Plea for Moderation. At one assize I traversed the indictment for the Sermon, which was therefore to be tried the next assize viz., in the spring following. About the latter end of October next, after I had traversed the indictment for my Sermon, I was cited to appear at the Bishop's Court. When I appeared there, articles were exhibited against me for the Sermon against Persecution. A copy of them being delivered to me, I was ordered to bring my *personal answer* to them in writing the next court day. This I did, and the same day additional positions and articles were exhibited against me for the Sermon, &c. and the Plea. A copy of these being delivered to me, I was required to give in my personal answer in writing unto them the next court day, which was by adjournment (I think) the first Tuesday in March following. The crimes I am charged with are set forth."

The Sermon is styled a "scandalous libel," and its author is declared "with a malicious mind and wicked intention to derogate from and procure contempt to the ecclesiastical laws and statutes, &c., as corrupt and superstitious, to the great damage of the Bishops," &c.

Passages were quoted in the indictment from the Sermon and the Plea to sustain the charges. They are too long for quotation; but the passages we have already given contain some of the words against which exception was taken.

"My answer," Mr. Bold continues, "to the articles being said to be worse than the books, the Bishop thought fit to determine

that all was fully proved against me, and proceeded to sentence, which was, that I should preach three recantation sermons,—one in the parish church of Dorchester, one in the parish church of Blandford, one in the parish church of Shaftesbury, on three Lord's days in the forenoon, before Easter; and that copies of the sermons should be given to him before they were preached, to be approved; and that if I should refuse to make such recantation, I should be suspended from the benefice of Steeple, . . . and that I should pay the expenses of Andrew Cosen, the promoter, as taxed by the Bishop. This Andrew Cosen is styled by the Bishop a gentleman. This is certain, he was the Bishop's butler. On Thursday evening, in the week after the Bishop had pronounced his definitive sentence against me, the judges came to Dorchester. On Friday in the forenoon, two indictments against me were tried. One was for my Plea for Moderation towards Dissenters." The indictment was faulty and quashed. The judge ordered an amended indictment to be brought in in the afternoon. The other indictment was for a letter. An apothecary of Blandford had an information laid against him at the sessions for Nonconformity, and was obliged to pay £20. Six or seven weeks after, Mr. Bold saw the apothecary at church on a Lord's day in the forenoon and afternoon. Being indicted again for three months' absence from church, Bold wrote him a letter which contained these words: "Be sure you do not stoop to nor be afraid of the Tories, but approve yourself a resolute, faithful Protestant. Honest Protestants will not always be under a cloud." These words were placed in the indictment. "The jury went forth, and after a short stay returning, declared they found me guilty of the book. But the judge telling them that they were not sent out upon the book, but the letter, answer was made of the letter, which served the turn as effectually as if it had been given at first." At night the rectified indictment was brought in, founded upon the Plea for Moderation, and also an indictment upon the Sermon. From the Plea, the words objected to were,—

"There ought not any thing to be universally required of all men in the service of God, but what has either equal agreeableness to all men's tempers, or a direct and certain tendency to advance the interest of religion more or less in all men. For some instances which are proper to excite and quicken devotion in some men's breasts, have not the like tendency in reference unto others; and the goodness of the end will not justifie an universal imposition, till you can first of all make all men of one complexion.—Our present Sovereign doth in his Declaration concerning Ecclesiastical Affairs take notice, that some ceremonies may even lessen that piety and devotion, for the improvement whereof they might happily be first introduced, and consequently may well be dispensed with."

The sermon against Persecution was indicted as *seditious;* but

no words being inserted in the indictment, to remedy the defect the sermon was tacked on to the indictment.

"The Judge having set a fine upon me for every one of the indictments, the gaoler was ordered to take me into his custody, and to keep me in prison till the fines should be paid. The Monday following, the apparitor, with the promoter, came to the prison and cited me in the Bishop's name to appear at his Court the next day, certifying that if I did not appear there I should be proceeded against for contempt. But I, having appealed to a higher Court, sent one the next day who executed the orders of that higher Court upon the inferior officers in their own Court. Thus the Bishop's definitive sentence and final decree, with the former proceedings, were vacated. Before the next Court day came the Bishop was dead.

"When I had continued about seven weeks in prison, the fines set upon me by the Judge being paid, I departed from the prison and returned to Steeple. But the promoter being alive, the appeal was to be followed, those who had principally concerned themselves against me expressing a fulness of assurance that they should have certain success above. The proceedings in the Bishop's Court were transmitted. Yet before those who did interest themselves against me could begin their prosecution above, the promoter fell sick and died. And thus ended the ecclesiastical prosecutions against me. And here I do own I esteem my being indicted and suffering for my *Sermon against Persecution* and for my *Plea for Moderation*, and more particularly for my persuading a person in the evil days to approve himself a sincere Protestant, a much greater honour than any worldly preferment. I could mention several instances of treatment I experienced from those who concerned themselves against me on the aforementioned accounts, which were not attended with any marks of civility or good-nature; but the persons are dead, and I am willing their works should die with them. They had the pleasure to give vent to the inclinations and passions which had the ascendant over them. And I heartily bless God I then had and still have this satisfaction, that neither their number nor their power did terrify me into any wicked or cowardly compliance. They after all their efforts left me where they found me, and there, through the great patience and goodness of God, I am at this time.

"Steeple, May 26, 1720."

Having given, for the most part in his own words, Mr. Bold's account of these strange proceedings, we will afford the Bishop the opportunity of relating the same story, and shewing the share he directly or otherwise took in its chief incidents.

The narrative opens with a letter addressed to Archbishop Sheldon, dated Symondsbury, Aug. 12, 1682.

"From Blandford I had only time to send your Grace a sermon of one Sam. Bold, of my diocese, who is supposed to be supported by Mr. Trenchard* and others. And this indeed will shew your Grace that

* John Trenchard was, if not the first, one of the most distinguished of a Dorsetshire family of that name, who were active in promoting liberal politics both in their own county and in the nation generally. He was educated at Oxford, entering New College, 1665 (Wood's Athenæ, IV. 405); was elected

our grand jury hath expressed their dislike of him, and Judge Raymond hath caused process to issue forth against him; and now it will be fitt time to call him into the Ecclesiastical Court also, where he shall have according to his deserts. And I humbly beg the favour of your Grace to grant him no dispensation to hold two livings, should he attempt it; though he thinks to hold them both without me. But I have sent to the patron of the first living to present a new clerk, and have issued forth a sequestration upon the profits in the mean time. Yet he endeavours to collect them.

"I prevailed also with the grand jury to return thanks to H. M. for executing the penal laws against Dissenters, which may be of great concerne if other counties would doe the like, both in answering further objections against prosecutions of the laws, and for prevention of any sort of toleration, which the fanatics now persuade themselves to gain in a small time by prevalent friends at court.

"W. Bristol."

There were other pens at work against Mr. Bold; and one of the correspondents of the Archbishop forwarded to him this anonymous letter, probably addressed to one of the neighbouring clergymen:

"Rev. Sir,—I heare that some are about to move his Lordship the Archbishop of Canterbury to grant a dispensation of non-residence on the vicarage of Shapwick, in Dorsetshire, to one Samuel Bolde, vicar there. If any such thing should be, pray inform my Lord that this same Bold hath lately preached and printed a most seditious and phanaticall sermon against persecuting, with his name at large affixed to itt, printed for A. Churchhill, at the Black Swan, near Amen Corner, most dreadfully damning the execution of the laws against Dissenters under the title of persecution, and damning eternally all such as put the laws in execution against them. This I thought good to advertise you of, that my Lord may know what manner of spiritt the man is of. His ———* will be that he will allow the whole revenue to a curatt. But such a man's curatt will be under a very ill influence and direction. Pray accept this so needful advertisement from an unknown hand."

Early in the following year, the Bishop of Bristol writes thus on the topics which he knew would interest the Archbishop:

M.P. for Taunton, 1679, and voted with the party who sought to exclude the Duke of York from the throne; was accused of participation in the plot with Lord William Russell, but escaped the fate of Lord Russell. His journey home was an ovation, and the congratulations of "anabaptists, sectaries and other disaffected persons," as reported to Government, gave great umbrage. On the landing of the Duke of Monmouth, Mr. Trenchard fled to France. He took an active share in the Revolution, and held various offices under the Government of William and Mary, and at the time of his death in 1695 he was Secretary of State. In accordance with the remark of the Bishop in the letter above, Mr. Roberts, in his Life of the Duke of Monmouth, says, "Every evil design against the Government was judged to have Trenchard at the bottom of it." (I. 213.) Madam Trenchard, the mother of Sir John, is often mentioned as a patroness of the Nonconformists of Dorsetshire. One of their ministers was often private chaplain and tutor in her family.

* Illegible.

"January 6, 1682.*

"I caused Mr. Bold to be summoned to appear to answer articles, which he did not; therefore ordered a further day: for about that time Dr. Raines, of the Commons, sent me his opinion of that scandalous sermon, with his advice to grant letters of request for prosecution of Bold in the Arches. For he says, though the sermon be a virulent libel in the main against the ground of church discipline, yet no particular passage directly impugns any one canon of the Church of England. And considering the weakness of the advocates and proctors here, and the industrie of the factious to support this person, least any failure should be in proceeding, if it be your Grace's pleasure to permit it, I shall readily assent to it: the Dr. offering now to prosecute him warmly.

"Harding,† the late minister of Poole, coming in again by the late Lord Chancellor's suspension of the commission, makes the fanatics there to triumph, and gives offence to the gentlemen in Dorset who were concerned in that commission; but I hope Mr. Etherick‡ will out the person again, by your Grace's favour and assistance. And there is as great need of a commission for Lyme, where one Short,§ son to him in Exeter prison, reads logic and philosophy to young people, scholars, and so makes it a nursery of the fanatics. I have sent to Mr. Etherick concerning both, and shall acquaint your Grace with his resolutions. I know my Lord Keeper will help us in so good a work.

"Upon the 5th of November last, the head constable of the hundred was taken as a preacher, and he and his conventicle convicted before one Mr. Elliston,‖ justice of peace; but no warrant being granted out by the said justice till I came into the county, the criminals conveyed away their goods and made them over to others in that time, and now no distress is to be found by the constables. I have ordered the informer and

---

* 1683. The new year then beginning March 25.

† The Bishop intended probably to write "Hardy." Samuel Hardy was a man of some eminence in his day. He was educated at Wadham College, Oxford, and lost his degree of M.A. through scruples as to the oaths. He officiated at Poole, Charminster, Weymouth and Newbury, sometimes connected with the Church, but not conforming to the ceremonies, and sometimes amongst the Nonconformists. He was closely connected with the Trenchards, and some of his persecutions arose from his assisting John Trenchard in an election at Poole, in which the Court candidate, a son of the Lord Chancellor, was defeated. He was chosen minister of Poole, 1667, but was dismissed for Nonconformity by a commission from the Crown bearing date Aug. 23, 1683. He died at Newbury, 1690.

‡ The reference is doubtless to Anthony Etterick, of Holt Lodge, Wimbourne, the Recorder of Poole. Before him the Duke of Monmouth was first taken on his apprehension subsequent to the battle of Sedgemoor. Etterick was an antiquary as well as a lawyer, and contributed the addition to Dorset in Camden's Britannia.

§ Amos (or Ames) Short, the father, was one of the ejected ministers of Lyme Regis, of whose sufferings from persecution Calamy has given a particularly full and interesting account. (Continuation, pp. 416—420.) The son, to whom the Bishop refers, educated young men for the ministry at both Colyton and Lyme, and removed to London to become pastor of an Independent congregation at Miles Lane. (Wilson's Diss. Churches, I. 465.)

‖ This name, also variously spelt Ellisdon and Ellesdon, was that of a magistrate of Charmouth. He made an unsuccessful attempt to procure a passage for Charles II. after the battle of Worcester. Though not coming up to the Bishop's ideas, he was, according to other accounts, sufficiently active as a Tory magistrate.

his witnesses to appear at the quarter sessions next week and renew the conviction. This case I must in duty lay before my Lord Keeper, for such trashing of the execution of the laws will ruine us."

"January 17, 1683.

"Harding, of Poole, is out again and dares not appear. Bold skulks about, for fear of being taken up by a peace process which is out against him. If by your Grace's favour I may grant letters of request to the Arches (other agents being too weak to deal with him below), Dr. Raines promises me to prosecute him vigorously."

"January 26, 1683.

"Bold is in my Court for his late Sermon and Plea, and one Wyne* for some public expressions in the pulpit tending to sedition..... I have been lately with the magistrates of Lyme and Bridport, two corrupt corporations which have poysoned all these parts a long time, and I perceive from them that a *scire facias* would bring in their charters with great ease, being assisted by the King's friends there; farther I dare not move. This county is much amended since Mr. Ellisdon, a late justice of peace, was put out of commission."

"August 29, 1683.

"May it please your Grace,—At Sherborne assizes, Mr. Sam. Bold appeared and had been acquitted, had I not been there to cause two new indictments to be drawn against him, and since that ordered him to be summoned into the Ecclesiastical Court for the same seditious Sermon."

"February 24, 1683.

"May it please your Grace,—I have for some time continued the Ecclesiastical Court at Bridport..... I called Mr. Wyne, minister of Dorchester, into the Court for preaching publickly some passages that tended to the encouragement of the phanatiques and discouragement of loyal men in that town, which he made an open recantation of before the clergie of my diocese in Court at Bridport, and hath promised future obedience to the canons and constitutions of the Church. At last I gained the assistance of my Chancellor, and came to a sentence against famous Mr. Bold for his Sermon and Plea, and sentence being passed, he entered his appeal; in which I hope your Grace will please to allow the impudent man no favour."

The original decree and sentence of the Ecclesiastical Court, penned in barbarous Latin (one of the words used is *doctrinibus*), signed by the Bishop, the Registrar, &c., is included in the Tanner MSS. (Vol. cxxix. fo. 104). It specifies Bold's refusal to make the required retractation, and his consequent suspension and deprivation of the living of Steeple.

March 2, the Bishop writes to the Archbishop, enclosing the sentence against Mr. Bold, and informing his Grace that Bold appeals to the Court of Arches. "I wish myself health to be able to act now, yet what I have done is much envied by many that should have more discretion."

* This was Robert Wyne, the author of "Elisii Campi, the Paradise of Delights," 12mo, 1672. He was at Tammerton, in the county of Devon, and at Clifton, in the county of Dorset. Calamy intimates that being harassed in his place, he left the Church soon after the Revolution and turned Nonconformist. (Account, p. 284.)

The last letter of the Bishop's bears date March 10, 1683-4:

"My present sickness kept me from the assizes at Dorchester, but I sent my chaplain thither, who upon affidavit made that Mr. Bold owned his Sermon and Plea in my Court and was under sentence for it, the judge committed the said Bold to gaol and fined him 100 marks."

At last the Bishop's efforts are crowned with success. The humble but heroic clergyman, against whom, after nearly two years of civil and ecclesiastical persecution, sentences of suspension, deprivation, fine and imprisonment, threaten utter ruin, lies in Dorchester jail. He was innocent of the crime of Nonconformity, for he scrupled not to profess the creeds and to obey the rubrics of his Church. His only crime was that he pleaded for mercy towards those whose conscience forbad a like conformity. His diocesan, who should have been his protector and friend, was the man to put into action all the machinery of persecution. But the poor prisoner was less an object of compassion than the Bishop, whose last energy was expended in his persecution. After a week of weeks' imprisonment, Bold was free, and had nothing more to fear from Bishop Gulston, who had received the inevitable summons, and was *where the wicked cease from troubling*. His successor in the see of Bristol was Bishop Lake. From him Bold had no trouble. Unmolested he returned to his pulpit at Steeple. The other living of Shapwick he did not hold after 1688.

The next of his printed sermons was on his favourite subject: "An Exhortation to Charity, and a Word of Comfort to the Irish Protestants; being a Sermon preached at Steeple, in Dorsetshire, upon occasion of the Collection for Relief of the poor Protestants in this Kingdom lately fled from Ireland. By Sam. Bold, Rector there. (Rom. viii. 18.)" He styles persecution "a horrible and inexcusable villany. The name is so apparently odious that no party, whilst under the guilt and in the practice of the thing, will own it."

"It thwarts and contradicts all the dictates of human nature. It breaks all the bonds and ties of common civility. It is most opposite and contrary to and most destructive of all the purposes and designs of every part and branch of the Christian religion. It abuses those for whom God has the greatest love. It vilifies and casts infamy upon them whom God will for ever glorify. And if God will reward his suffering, persecuted servants with the greatest measure of glory, what shall become of the persecutors and troublers of his people? If they impenitently persist in their persecuting course, it were better for them they had never been born; or, being born, that a mill-stone were hanged about their necks, and they thrown into the depth of the sea."

Here for the present we must pause. In another and concluding chapter we shall give an account of Mr. Bold's other works, and of his correspondence, so far as it has yet come to light, with the great philosopher of England, John Locke.

GEORGE HARRIS: A MEMOIR.

Chapter IV.

FROM ENGLAND TO SCOTLAND.

The biographical facts contained in our last chapter may be said to relate as a whole to the subject of missionary exertions.

The objections which have been from time to time urged against such exertions in connection with Unitarianism will be found to owe all their force to that limitation of Unitarianism which confines its application to the necessities of a mere theological controversy. "Why should we proselyte others to our opinions? Why should we contend with others because their opinions differ from ours? Those whom we would indoctrinate, or with whom we may quarrel, are just as good when let alone by us as when interfered with on our part. We can enjoy our own convictions among ourselves without bringing them into public discussion, and the enjoyment will be greater when undisturbed by such discussion." This is the course of thought which has been expressed with more or less distinctness in justification of a policy that would circumscribe Unitarian efforts by the existing line of established congregational agency.

I freely allow that if Unitarianism does consist only of this difference of opinion, it may be right to deal with it in this spirit of reservation. I am afraid I must go further, and declare that those who practise the reservation do hold their Unitarianism as a mere matter of opinion, and are therefore consistent in demanding a sectarian exclusiveness for that which is of a distinctively sectarian character. But I have no sympathy with this kind of sectarianism. I take the view of the case which I have already described as strongly influencing the life I am attempting to portray. I adopt Unitarianism because, as far as it goes, it expresses my views of Christian truth; and what I am concerned with is the religious obligation under which I lie with regard to that truth, and not any difference which may separate me theologically from others. It is necessary to my religious life that I should avail myself of the opportunities of religious influence that are offered to me. I have thus to "let my light shine before men." If I refuse or neglect to do so, I so far cease to be a religious man. If a church refuses or neglects to exert the religious influence it possesses, it so far ceases to be a religious institution. The principles of Christianity and the history of Christianity equally bind us to diffuse the knowledge and blessing of Christian truth through society, and our not doing so is rightly taken as a tacit confession that we do not really aspire to the character which our profession indicates. No Christian body can vindicate the reality of its faith in the sight of mankind except by such measures as will prove that faith to be efficient for the practical

purposes of Christianity; and when that efficiency is proved, all objections to the faith on mere doctrinal grounds become comparatively powerless.

If, in the discharge of the work of benefiting the world by promoting religious belief and obedience, we have to uproot error as well as to establish truth,—that is but one of the conditions under which our duty is to be fulfilled; and if in fulfilling it we come into collision with those who dissent from our views, —that is but a necessary sacrifice required from us by fidelity. When the work imposed upon us is mainly that of removing error and withstanding opposition, we are under no less responsibility to discharge it, on the broad ground of religious obligation, than we should be if that work related to the enforcement of an acknowledged moral duty. We cannot separate between the moralities of the two kinds of work as they relate to ourselves. We have indeed to be careful that we do stand upon the broad ground of religious responsibility, and not upon any narrow one of sectarian opinion only; but it is not for us to choose the line of action which that obligation opens before us. That is prescribed for us by the natnre of our faith and its relation to the circumstances in which we are placed. Unitarian missionary efforts must, on both the accounts just alluded to, partake largely of doctrinal and controversial exposition. We may wish the case were otherwise, but so it is; and, if we act up to that case at all, we must conform ourselves to this necessity belonging to it.

Is there nothing to counterbalance the peculiar irksomeness of the Unitarian position? What say we to the consideration that our distinctive views of Christian truth are necessary to reconcile to any belief in Christianity the mass of persons who are now alienated from religion altogether? Such, most of us are convinced, is the fact; and in that fact we discover our special calling. A more honourable calling none could desire. We have it in our power to shew that Christianity is worthy of all acceptation, on the very grounds on which orthodoxy has been rejected or been found impossible of credence. We cannot shew this without much theological contention; but to do so, even by means of that contention, is to advance no narrow sectarian cause, but the wide, general interests of Christianity itself.

I cannot forbear from noticing here with strong approbation the sentiments on the subject of Unitarian missions which were expressed in the last number of the Christian Reformer by Mr. Hodgson Pratt. The respective relations of religion and theology to missionary efforts are set forth in his paper with a special force, arising from the practical considerations to which the paper is devoted.

When we look back upon the course of events that has just passed under our review, and bring it into connection with

events with which we are now concerned affecting the same part of the kingdom, the theory of Christian duty on which I am insisting presents itself to us in a peculiarly interesting form.

Let us imagine that during his Lancashire ministry Mr. Harris had, in carrying out his missionary designs, met with treatment essentially different from that which he experienced. If his brother ministers had cordially co-operated with him, encouraging his efforts and assisting him by similar efforts of their own, and if the wealthy and influential laity had sanctioned and supported the measures thus undertaken by the clergy, it cannot be doubted that Unitarianism would have occupied a much more advanced position than it does occupy, in relation to the present population of the province. I am willing to allow,—I have indeed already intimated,—that both the ministers and people to whom I have alluded were as conscientious in their conduct as Mr. Harris and his friends were in theirs; but it is none the less true, that the one conduct prevented results which the other would have produced. In what has fallen under my observation in connection with the missionary efforts lately originated by the Provincial Assembly, I have been particularly struck with the manner in which the localities now demanding attention answer to the localities that received similar attention at the time I have been reviewing. This correspondence proves that the seed which was sown, though it might be afterwards neglected, did not perish, and it certainly indicates that if the sowing had been tried upon a wider field it would have been rewarded by a co-extensive harvest. Since the year 1825, with which we had last to do, two facts have happened bearing forcibly upon the question under notice. One of them is, the great change which has taken place in the current statements of orthodoxy. That change, by which the prevalent religious belief has adapted itself to the civilization of the age, has been altogether in favour of those views of Christian doctrine with which Unitarianism is identified. The other fact is, the adoption of views substantially Unitarian by numbers of persons who have separated from Methodism. A new door of usefulness has thus been opened to Unitarian zeal in addition to the ordinary means of influence of which that zeal might avail itself. The Rochdale and Rossendale societies, before alluded to, might almost be supposed to have been raised up in order to prepare Unitarianism for that further work of Methodist conversion which after events seemed formed to put into its hand. Surely no one can dispute the conclusion, that if a general scheme for missionary operation had been in efficient exercise while the two facts I have mentioned were in the course of development, much that is lost might have been secured, and more would have been accomplished than the agencies actually at command could effect.

Happily we see this matter in a clearer light than those who

immediately preceded us were permitted to do. An ardent desire to engage in missionary work prevails throughout the Lancashire and Cheshire province, instead of the opposition or indifference that formerly prevailed. The case is so far reversed, that where coldness on this subject was the rule and warmth the exception, now warmth is the rule and coldness the exception. This I believe to be the state of feeling among most of our congregations, though much needs to be done in the regulation and application of that feeling in order that it may be made available for the practical purposes on which it legitimately bears. This is a beneficial and hopeful alteration of circumstances. But while we rejoice on its account, we ought not to forget our debt of gratitude to those who "bore the burden and heat of the day" in which our joy was wrought out. Mr. Harris and those who acted with him may at times have acted unwisely and intemperately: they may have yielded to some of the temptations presented by the strife through which they passed, and manifested some of the infirmities that cling to humanity in spite of its purest intentions: but what we are reaping is that which they sowed. In sacrificing themselves for the common good, they fulfilled the law of Christ on our behalf as well as on their own; and while we do not blind ourselves to their faults nor commit injustice toward their opponents, let us not withhold from them the generous and just acknowledgment that "other men laboured, and we have entered into their labours."

What I have previously spoken of as the special calling of Unitarianism in its missionary relations, is applicable in a striking manner to the state of things to which I am about now to direct the reader's attention: I mean the religious condition of Scotland at the time to which my narrative has brought us. I have to speak of efforts that were made to establish and extend Unitarian preaching in that country; and, in defence as well as in explanation of those efforts, I shall have to bring out the fact that there, even more than in England, it was needed that some form of Christian belief should be rendered prevalent which was reconcilable with the renunciation of orthodoxy. Unitarianism could only supply that form fairly and honestly; and, considering the peculiar conditions of the need to which I have referred, the promotion of Unitarianism there by missionary operations had commendations distinctively its own.

I have said that Mr. Harris removed from Bolton in September 1825. He immediately commenced his ministry in Glasgow by conducting three services there on Sunday, October 2. He had accepted the invitation from Glasgow some months before. An application had, indeed, been made to him from the Glasgow congregation as early as November 1824, conveying their unanimous wish that he should assume the direction of their affairs. This application he at first declined to comply with, but it was

renewed in more pressing terms, and with such manifestations of the determination of the people to uphold him in the office to which he was called, as persuaded him to consent to it. In his letter of acceptation, dated April 20, 1825, after referring to his unwillingness to sever the affectionate bonds by which he was united to his Bolton congregation, he thus speaks of the motives by which he was influenced in choosing the particular sphere of labour upon which he was about to enter:

"At the same period that I received the invitation to which I am now replying, I was also invited to take the pastoral charge of the congregation of York Street, St. James's Square, London. The office was superior, in a worldly point of view, to the one with which you favoured me. London is a more commanding station even than Glasgow; the influence which I should immediately have obtained in our denomination much greater—the society to which I should have been introduced more splendid. But then I also recollected that London could ensure to itself a minister, and that it was probable that Glasgow could not; that the metropolis of England had other and able advocates of truth, whilst at Glasgow there was but one Unitarian chapel; and that therefore my obligations to the truth of Heaven called upon me to prefer Glasgow. Notwithstanding those obstacles which those who know the world, and are acquainted with mankind and the workings of the human heart, can alone duly appreciate, my determination is now fixed to do all I can to promote the cause in a quarter where its enemies are more numerous, its friends but few, and those despised,—and to stand in the front of the battle between truth and error, where other persons perhaps would not be found to brave the contest."

It may be well to look, for a short time, at the sphere of labour which thus opened itself before him; endeavouring especially to estimate some of the difficulties by which it was characterized. I will do so at the risk of repeating some things which I may have elsewhere written or said.

Scotland, as every one knows, has been long distinguished by an almost uniform profession of religion both as to doctrine and discipline. It is so distinguished now, although it is pretty equally divided into three different sects, because those sects differ from each other only as to matters within the common sphere of Calvinistic theology and Presbyterian polity. But at the time of which we have to speak, before this threefold division took place, the general uniformity was more marked to outward observation than it is at present. The Established Church of England has but few points in common with the Dissenting bodies in that country, and those bodies embrace a great variety of character and administration among themselves; but in Scotland, the Established Church is the type after which the Dissenting bodies have been constructed. The consequence of this state of things is, that whatsoever opposes itself to an orthodox belief, is in Scotland met with a far stronger

resistance than can be offered in the South. When that which passes under the name of heresy presumes even in the South to assert itself decisively, it has to contend with a combination of forces which the peculiar danger draws into an unwonted union; but, in the North, the presumption of such a proceeding is considered greater by reason of the greater national agreement it contradicts, and the combined force directed against it is stronger in proportion to the more favourable circumstances under which it is originated. It is truly the case with the heretic there, that "his hand is against every man, and every man's hand against him." Not that heresy has not been a native growth of Scotland, or that quite independently of foreign operations it has not there had a luxuriant spread. Both these things are among the plainest facts; but they are connected with another fact no less evident than they, viz., that heretical convictions have not altered the orthodox profession, but have been cherished under the protection of such profession. The Scotch heretic has always been a man scrupulously careful not so to develop his heresy as in circumstances of danger to forfeit the credit of orthodoxy. In addition to the reason for this prudential proceeding which is contained in the extraordinary force of public opinion already mentioned, it is worthy of passing notice that the Scotch character is, generally speaking, open to the influence of public opinion in a greater degree than the English character is. Find him wherever you may, a Scotchman will shew himself peculiarly submissive to the circumstances around him. Rouse him to resistance by some intolerable wrong, and no man will fight more furiously or more obstinately; but his normal condition is that of pursuing his own interest in a spirit of accommodation which often extends to subserviency. It may be well to mark how nearly, in spite of such causes as those referred to, the heretical tendencies of the people of this country have approached toward revolutionizing the established belief. It will be seen that the nearness of approach only made the impossibility of the revolution being effected on the undermining principle, which was alone adopted, the more apparent.

Every reader of Burns's poems must be well aware that heresy on the questions involved in the Unitarian controversy prevailed extensively during his time in the West of Scotland. Not only could he with impunity express his own sympathy with the New-light party, and reprobate and satirize the Old-light party, but the manner in which his theological utterances were received, proves that the leaven of his opinions was rapidly leavening the whole lump of Scotch society. The *Epistle to John Goudie, of Kilmarnock*, who had written a notoriously heretical book of Essays, declares more than personal assent. The anticipation of triumph in which it indulges, implies a large popularity for the side it espouses.

"Auld Orthodoxy lang did grapple,
But now she's got an unco ripple;
Haste, gie her name up i' the chapel
Nigh unto death:
See, how she fetches at the thrapple,
And gasps for breath."

That the East as well as the West of Scotland was deeply affected with a disbelief of the authorized faith, is well known to every one in the slightest degree acquainted with the character of the Edinburgh society of this time.

In the North, Dr. Gerard, who filled the theological chair of King's College, Aberdeen, is said to have delivered lectures on the person of Christ composed after the same method as that which Mr. Belsham had pursued at Daventry; and though he never avowed his theological opinions, it cannot be doubted that the influence of his teaching must have been detrimental to orthodoxy. In fact, his son, who spoke of his father as "without doubt a Unitarian in the strictest sense," also expressed his belief that a large portion of the clergy of the North of Scotland were of the same opinions.* Dr. John Evans, whose name has been already mentioned in this biographical sketch, says of Gerard's lectures in combination with those of Professor Cambell, "Replete with good sense and unostentatious piety, they have left an indelible impression on my heart. They first taught me to think and reason for myself in matters of religion—at the same time uniformly guarding the pupil against intolerance and bigotry."†

It would be easy to multiply testimonies to the heretical repute into which this nominally Calvinistic country had fallen during the latter half of the last century. One of them which has fallen under my observation is no less curious than conclusive. In an almost forgotten book—Myles's *Chronological History of the People called Methodists*—reference having been made to the introduction of Methodism into Scotland, it is added: "One great design in sending preachers thither is, to make a stand against the overflowing of Arianism and Socinianism in that country."‡ In Lindsey's *Historical View*, we are furnished with the following declaration, copied from the books of the Presbytery of Stranraer, which a minister who felt aggrieved by his former subscription was, after his case had undergone discussion in the Presbytery of Stranraer and Synod of Galloway, admitted to make. The parishioners of Inch not only approved of this declaration, but sent to the Presbytery of Stranraer a petition, in which they stated their own attachment

* Monthly Repository, Vol. VIII. p. 326.
† Christian Pioneer, Vol. X. p. 162.
‡ Myles's History of the Methodists, p. 57.

to the principle of scriptural liberty, in terms no less strong than those employed by their minister.

"I, Andrew Ross, Minister of the Gospel in the parish of Inch (for the exoneration of my conscience, more particularly with respect to the terms of ministerial communion injoined by this Church), hereby declare, That I firmly adhere to the fundamental principles of the Protestant religion, namely, that the holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are the only rule of faith and practice; that the exercise of private judgment is the undoubted right and duty of every Christian and of every Christian minister, and that it is the best means of discovering the true sense of Scripture; that the Lord Jesus Christ is appointed the sole Head and Lawgiver of his Church, and the only Master in religion. And I also declare, that I reject all doctrines and practices that are inconsistent with these principles, as witness my hand this third day of January, 1776. ANDREW ROSS."*

On reading such a remarkable document as this, one might be led to expect that some effort would have been made to gain the liberty it claims for the whole Scottish kirk, and thus to secure an honest expression of the interdicted views really held by a great portion of its clergy and people. Such, however, was not the case. Both ministers and laity reconciled themselves to the contradiction between their belief and profession, and were only anxious that they should not be disturbed in the position they occupied. This dishonourable procedure produced its natural fruits. The theological opinions thus surreptitiously cherished contracted an immoral taint. The grounds of Christian belief on which those opinions rested were never fairly stated. The utmost subtility was employed in devising compromises between truth and error. A sceptical spirit took the place of religious faith in any sense. Whatever would shake conviction was gladly accepted as lessening the value of that which it had been determined to slight. A deeply-rooted and wide-spread infidelity sprung up as the result of these various influences; and those who could not yield to unbelief were thrown back upon orthodoxy as the only shelter from irreligion. It is the object of a creed-bound church to identify its creed with Christianity, and the danger to which it is ever exposed is that of producing a renunciation of Christianity whenever the creed is disputed—a danger the worse and not the better when the renunciation is not openly avowed.

The Scotch are a people of a highly metaphysical genius. It is their habit to regard the questions that present themselves to them in a strictly philosophical light, and to content themselves, on matters in which they are interested, with mere abstract reasoning. Orthodoxy is a philosophy: Calvinism is this philosophy reduced to its severest expression. Such a system by its very

* Lindsey's Historical View, p. 560.

nature must always have strong attractions for people of this kind; and even when its theological dogmas as such are found to be indefensible, its philosophy may retain a strong hold upon their minds. It is quite wonderful how the persons with whom you meet in Scotland—believers, unbelievers, semi-believers and would-be believers—can, by means of metaphysical speculations, manage to accommodate themselves, as upon principle, to a uniformity of practice which would seem to be essentially opposed to the true state of things among them. This habit of philosophizing—indulged as it is till the mere intellectual exercise itself becomes of more importance than the result to which it is professedly adapted—presents as formidable a barrier against any attempts to change the religious profession in consistency with doubt or disbelief, as the most unreasoning assent to the authorized faith could do. Having thus persuaded themselves to silent acquiescence in the established forms, the heretics will be generally found even more averse to any open declaration of their heresy on the part of others than the orthodox are. An inconsistent and unfaithful resistance is always more intolerant than a sincere and upright one. In Hugh Miller's *First Impressions of England and its People*, there is a story about his confuting some southern heretics which curiously illustrates the national characteristic on which I have been just remarking. He describes himself as entering into a dispute on the subject of the atonement which was being carried on in the public room of an inn in Newcastle-upon-Tyne. His part of the dispute consisted in his enforcing upon his audience the doctrine of moral necessity as compelling the Deity to adopt the principle of expiation, in contradistinction to his attempting any defence of that principle on common grounds of morality. "I was curious to see," he says, "how the metaphysics of our Scotch Calvinism would tell on such an audience, and took up the subject much in the way it might be taken up in some country churchyard, ere the congregation had fully gathered, by some of the 'grave-livers' of the parish, or as it might be discussed in the more northern localities of the kingdom, at some evening meeting of 'the men.'" I have no doubt that the "audience" was completely confounded by the display, and the conclusion of the tale is very naturally given thus: "The countryman was silent. 'You Scotch are a strange people,' said one of the commercial gentlemen.'"*

Whatever advantages for the Unitarian cause in Scotland might have arisen from the New-light movement within the Established Church, they were more than neutralized, at the time of Mr. Harris's Scotch ministry, by the evangelical revival of which Dr. Chalmers was the main instrument. The impulse which his

* First Impressions of England and its People, pp. 8—10.

preaching gave to orthodox sentiment was the commencement of a religious movement that cannot be called less than national. His genius, his eloquence, his earnestness, pre-eminently fitted him for being a leader of opinion; and the form in which he set forth the doctrines he promulgated was singularly adapted to the character of the people he influenced. He identified orthodoxy with a certain philosophical view on which he strongly insisted, and by which he gained for it a renewed attention of the Scotch mind. He laid science as well as revelation under contribution to the advancement of his views; and he gave to those views a social application which was scarcely less marked than their theological one, and thus conciliated the practical habits of his countrymen in their favour. The effect of his efforts was moreover mightily assisted by the plain fact that they were, after all, but a summons to the honest adoption of conclusions that were professed in dishonesty. Account for it as we may, however, the change produced was marvellously great. The courage of the adherents to the hereditary Calvinism was invigorated, and their utmost exertions were put forth on its behalf: the faith of the standards of the Church was re-accepted by the unbelieving and zealously acted upon by the hitherto indifferent; and those who still continued to retain their heretical latitudinarianism slunk into a deeper concealment than they had been accustomed to practise before. There never was a clearer manifestation of the weakness of a theological position which is not supported by integrity, than that which the thorough defeat of the moderate party by the rising evangelicals presented. It was of course a consequence of this change of circumstances that the opposition to anything like a profession of Unitarianism was increased, both on the part of those who hated Unitarianism for its own sake, and on the part of those whose cowardice withheld them from professing it. This increased opposition existed in its greatest force at the period with which we have now immediately to do. Dr. Chalmers began his ministry in Glasgow in 1815, and closed it in 1823; and this was the portion of his course in which his most powerful popular agency was developed. In undertaking, therefore, the work of Unitarian propagandism in Glasgow in 1825, Mr. Harris threw himself into the thick of the fight when his cause had all its natural disadvantages intensified to the greatest possible degree.

A few anecdotes illustrative of the strength of hostility with which Unitarianism had at this time to contend may be introduced here, especially as they relate directly or indirectly to the individual whose ministerial course we are following.

When Mr. Harris commenced preaching at Greenock, it was several times the case that he could not get any one to post up the placards on which his lectures were announced. Besides

this, after being posted, they were very frequently torn from the walls. He met the difficulty by going out with a friend between twelve and one o'clock at night, and sticking up the bills on the walls with his own hands.

On his announcing an intention to preach in the Greenock theatre, he was remonstrated with by his friends, who set before him the personal danger to which he would thus expose himself. He gave no heed to the remonstrance, however, and on his appearance upon the stage a great disturbance was commenced, and some missiles were thrown at him from the gallery. He calmly opened the Bible and read, from the 19th chapter of Acts, the account of the tumult excited in the theatre at Ephesus by Demetrius and his craftsmen. This immediately gained the attention of the whole assembly, and on his concluding the Scripture he said, "Let us pray." The result was, that he afterwards delivered one of his most effective discourses amid the profoundest silence.

The builder of the Union-Street chapel in Glasgow never obtained an order for another building of like importance. He and his friends attributed this to the common prejudice against everything connected with Unitarianism. His consenting in the way of his trade to promote Unitarian purposes was sufficient to produce his ruin in business.

Shortly before Mr. Harris came to Glasgow, five members of the Unitarian church were discharged from their employment under the following circumstances. An elder of the kirk, a calender by trade, mentioned to his minister that he had persons in his employ belonging to different sects, and particularly specified Catholics and Unitarians. The minister said that the Unitarians were dangerous people, for they were generally intelligent and led others astray. The elder summoned the five Unitarian workmen before him, told them what the minister had said, and discharged them on that ground.

A well-dressed man once met Mr. Harris in the streets of Glasgow, and suddenly turning from the causeway into the carriage road said, as he went aside, "Devil!"

I shall conclude this chapter with a short account of the Glasgow church previous to Mr. Harris's pastoral connection with it.

The Unitarian society in Glasgow consisted originally of certain individuals who had adopted Universalist opinions. This was not an uncommon nor an unnatural origin of such a society in Scotland. The Edinburgh and the Paisley societies arose in a similar way, and Universalism was likely to be the first conclusion to which a reaction from Calvinism would lead. The first minister I can find any notice of in connection with Unitarianism in Glasgow is Dr. Spencer, who afterwards settled as a surgeon in Bristol. He had been a Baptist minister at Alcester,

in Warwickshire, and had become a Unitarian, when all his prepossessions were in favour of Trinitarianism, by simply following out a resolution to study the New Testament in its original language. After this change of opinion, he went to Edinburgh to prepare himself for the medical profession, intending, if possible, to unite the practice of medicine with the preaching of Christianity. In consistency with this intention, he conducted a religious service every Sunday in his lodgings during his residence in Edinburgh. This service was commenced in the year 1791. He had continued the work for about two years, when a gentleman from Glasgow, by whom he was accidentally heard, persuaded him to repeat the same service in that city; and his doing so led to his removal to Glasgow, where he became a public and avowed preacher of Unitarianism. The hostility directed against him in this capacity was extremely bitter. Stones were thrown at him through the windows of the room in Spreuil's Court in which he preached. His very life was in danger, several fanatics having threatened to lay violent hands upon him if he continued his labours, and an assault upon him being on one occasion actually attempted. On that occasion Mr. Auchenvole, the father of Mrs. Harris, stepped forward and told the assailants that they should not harm Dr. Spencer except by passing over his dead body. These violent proceedings did not, however, check the efforts which were being made in the hated cause. After Dr. Spencer, at the conclusion of his medical studies, removed to Bristol, the Unitarian interest was kept up by means of lay preaching. In 1803, the Rev. James Lyons visited Glasgow as a missionary from the Unitarian Fund. His was the first Unitarian mission to Scotland, and he succeeded here, as elsewhere in that kingdom, in giving a new impulse to the Unitarian faith. He was followed in 1809 by Richard Wright, whose labours were remarkably effective. Mr. Wright was able to bring Unitarianism into public discussion. A disputation in which he engaged was continued by adjournment for several evenings and attended by crowded audiences. It was said that on the last evening as many as two thousand persons went away who could not get into the place where it was held. In 1811, Mr. Wright paid a second missionary visit to Glasgow. He found then a division in the society; one party meeting in the Trades Hall, and the other in Provan's Hall; but he happily succeeded in uniting both parties under the ministry of the Rev. James Yates. Mr. Yates had previously engaged to take charge of Unitarianism in Glasgow, and he entered upon his office before Mr. Wright left that city. At an early part of Mr. Yates's ministry, the chapel in Union Street was built, and thus the cause which had for so long a time been struggling for existence, obtained the established character and position it has con-

tinued to maintain to the present time. Mr. Yates removed from Glasgow to Birmingham in 1816, and his place was taken by the Rev. Benjamin Mardon, who remained in Glasgow till 1825, when, as we have seen, Mr. Harris accepted an invitation to the pulpit.

THE NATIONAL-REVIEWER CONTROVERSY.

SIR,

ALLOW me to follow the example of Mr. Higginson, and to declare myself the author of the letters in your pages signed An Unitarian Layman.

I have only, in conclusion, to remark, that all which the National Reviewer has written leaves untouched, as I have no doubt it will ever remain, the real difficulty of his position, that if the gospel narratives do not truly record a bodily resurrection of Christ from the dead, they are valueless as evidence of a resurrection at all. I admit that the re-appearance of Christ after death, independently of a resurrection of the body, might give strong evidence of the existence of a future state, if the gospel narratives had recorded the event in that form. The question, however, is, not which kind of evidence would be the most satisfactory, but whether the gospel narratives of the resurrection are true or false. To myself, and to many others, the validity of the Reviewer's arguments would involve the destruction of all belief in Christianity as a divinely-authorized communication from God to men.

In the course I have taken I have acted in accordance with words which I once heard from the lips of a revered instructor of my own: "It is desirable that all well-educated persons should be 'ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh them a reason of the hope that is in them' as Theists and Christians." The duty of defending views which I believe to be of the highest value to mankind, and upon which the whole course of my own life has rested, has placed me in opposition to a friend whom I highly value, and for whom, whatever may have been our differences of feeling or opinion, I once more declare my high personal respect and warm personal regard. I now take leave of this controversy with the satisfaction of feeling that I have not, in the course of it, written a word which, at its close, I wish to recall.

WM. RAYNER WOOD.

Singleton, near Manchester, June 6, 1860.

[We regret that the accidental mislaying of this letter prevented its insertion in our last No.—ED. C.R.]

ON NATURAL DEPRAVITY.

As these are reforming times, and as some of the most distinguished members of our body have been recently reviewing, and to some extent remodeling, their former convictions, it has occurred to me that it may be profitable to truth to draw the attention of your readers to the philosophical view of natural depravity, which has long appeared to me to stand nearly as much opposed to the old Unitarian hypothesis as to that of popular orthodoxy; for while the popular notion is, that mankind was created in a perfectly immaculate state, without any moral infirmity, and pure and spotless as heaven's own light, but that by the transgression of the first human pair they suffered a total alteration of their nature, which morally degraded not only the first parents, but all their posterity, and thereby became so utterly depraved as to be incapable of any good thought or deed, and so prone to moral evil as to be by their fallen nature totally alienated from God and goodness; on the other hand, the Unitarian notion has been, that mankind have not suffered any change of nature or moral defilement by any transgression of their primeval ancestry, but retain the same unfallen nature as their first parents possessed at their creation. And so far I agree with them. But they appear to have adopted the orthodox notion, that mankind having come at first from the hand of their Maker as perfectly immaculate as angels, afterwards became personally and actually vitiated by individual transgression of the laws of their nature, and by which men *in general* became sinners; but which individual transgression, so far from being natural or hereditary, there have been many human beings who never transgressed at all, but retained the original purity of their unfallen nature,—as exemplified in the case of infants, idiots, and other obviously irresponsible persons, as well as in the case of such religiously-inspired persons, who have been so far exalted in spirit, that they, like Jesus Christ, may be said to have lived in heaven while remaining on earth.

Now it appears to me that the truth lies between these wide extremes,—namely, that man was not created or designed to be immaculate, which is proved by his mental and moral endowments being all fallible and infirm; and shewing that his natural constitution at his creation contained the seeds of moral infirmity, which afterwards bore depraved fruits; and thus being by nature a finite and fallible creature, he was mercifully endowed with the principle of self-preservation, as a means of protection to himself and his species; yet this self-preservative power was not only *liable* but *prone* to degenerate into selfishness, self-gratification, covetousness, and consequent estrangement from the principles of purity and justice, and therefore from God and goodness. And what is this but a sinful tendency, or at least a moral in-

firmity? Yet this tendency or proneness is the natural consequence of his finite and fallible endowments, and which proneness renders him as much the subject of moral evil as though it were the consequent effect of a primeval fall of the first human pair; and in either case it is clearly the post-adamite law of his nature.

The error of each party, therefore, seems to be, the supposition that man was originally created as an immaculate and nearly infallible being: and then the only real difference between the two is, that one supposes that the falling into transgression of the first human pair contaminated not only themselves but all their posterity; and the other, that mankind, without having any natural proneness to evil, have nevertheless individually fallen into sin, and that so quasi universally, that moral delinquency is the general rule, subject only to a comparatively few exceptions.

The word depravity, as coming from *de pravo*, signifies to make bad, vitiate or corrupt; and I use the word in its strictly literal sense in inferring that the natural principle of selfishness tends to make bad, vitiate and corrupt, and gives a natural proneness in that direction, until it is checked and influenced by superior mental agencies, i.e. just and enlightened principles refined by religion and sound philosophy, which the orthodox would call conversion to religion; and till so checked and influenced or converted, every sort of moral ill will follow in the train of the selfish principle. And if this be so, it may justly be called *natural* depravity; and if natural, it is not very far from *hereditary* depravity: not, however, that a son is bound naturally to be as depraved as his father was.

Hence the wide difference that has hitherto existed on this subject has probably been more of a verbal than of an essential nature, and for want of a true and precise definition of terms. And this may also be said of some other differences between orthodoxy and heterodoxy; and if opponent parties would carefully define the words they use, they would often see that they mean nearly the same thing.

In the volume of the Monthly Repository for the year 1823, p. 378, will be found a philosophical view of the origin of evil under my name, which argued that as man was endowed with only limited attributes, and could not be otherwise endowed, he must be liable to err in the miscalculation of happiness, and that the consequence of error in that calculation must inevitably issue in the production of moral ill; and this argument applies equally well to natural depravity as to the origin of moral evil, if indeed they are not identically the same; but I am not obliged to understand the word depravity in the same sense as it is used by the popular world, as implying that mankind are utterly vicious and wholly incapable of any good thought, motive or deed. On the contrary, I assume that, as men are not always under the influence of gross self-interest, they may *naturally* be capable of many

good thoughts, motives and actions; for why should they not, when uninfluenced by the selfish principle, have just feelings of moral right and wrong, as well as devout thoughts of God, "according to what a man hath"? Yet the natural proneness to gratify selfish desires still remains in all matters where *self* can become the question, and there are but few who are able to get entirely free from this influence; for how difficult is it to induce even sensible and religious people to see through the mist of their own self-interest or selfish prepossessions, and discern the true line of justice and truth; the veil of natural depravity intervenes and beclouds their vision, so that, though in general they can see clearly the small mote in another's eye, they cannot see the beam in their own eye.

It appears to me that our Unitarian ancestors, justly offended by the Calvinistic definition of natural depravity, were driven by the principle of counteraction to the opposite extreme, which prevented their seeing that it is the natural proneness to the selfish principle that forms the essence of the moral infirmity in question and the germ of all sin and wickedness, and without which man would have no motive to do wrong; and this proneness may be seen in all stages of humanity from the cradle to the grave.

Is not the true line betwixt these wide extremes well drawn by Pope?

> "Mean though I am—not wholly so,
> Since quickened by thy breath."

As I am not too proud or opinionated to be set right or refuted if wrong, I shall be glad to see any observations in reply from your more deep-thoughted readers.

Kingsdown, Bristol. G. Pulleyn Hinton.

THE INAUGURATION OF DR. PRIESTLEY'S STATUE AT OXFORD, JULY 3, 1860.

Time, the assertor of all truth, all right,
And the redresser of all wrong, hath cast
On Priestley his exalting smile at last,
Crowning his honoured brow with wreaths of light.
The clouds which veiled his radiancy have past;
And now, a fixed star breaking through the night,
He shines from heaven's celestial concave vast,
And shall shine on for ever, true and bright.
Doubt not—despair not. Though the present hour
Be wrapt in mists and with misfortunes shrouded,
Truth, knowledge, virtue, shall burst forth unclouded
In the serene benignity of power—
That all-subduing power which tireth never,
Nor tarrieth—onward urging—onward ever!

John Bowring.

HYMN BY SIR JOHN BOWRING,

SUNG BY THE CHILDREN OF THE PROTESTANT DISSENTING CHARITY SCHOOL OF GEORGE'S MEETING, EXETER, MAY, 1860.

With gentle words and gracious look,
The loving Saviour spoke and smiled,
When, in his welcoming arms, he took
A happy Child, and blessed the Child.

For childhood's earliest day begins
In the bright heav'n of innocence,
Ere wand'ring thoughts or tempting sins
Seduce its erring footsteps thence.

Would that as following years roll on,
Life's infant brightness might endure;
And leave us, when those years are gone,
Pure, as the happy Child is pure!

O God! who veil'st the future o'er,
Thro' whose thick darkness none can see,
Protect, preserve, redeem, restore,
The innocence of infancy!

TRANSLATION OF PETER BURMANN THE SECOND'S APOSTROPHE TO HUGO GROTIUS ON BEHOLDING HIS PORTRAIT.

Let Grotius, whom the Muses fashioned for arts refined,—
Let him, the greatest in law,—let him, on the lyre the greatest,
Afford an example which shall be told till the ages grow hoary,
Which the future may read with awe, and ponder dumb with amazement.
Was it for this, Mother-country, thou barest so great a son,
That thou, to a child of thine own, mightst become a cruel stepmother?
That, like the prisoner's, his hand might be bound in unmerited chains,
And bidden itself to hide in the dungeon's desolate darkness!
That hand, which shed the light o'er the stores of the learned past,
Renowned and ennobled for ever by its own eloquent pen!
That hand, to thee too devoted, and by its deeds approved,
And which so often had boldly thy glory dared to maintain!
Allia was not a day in the Roman year more impious
Than that which caused a Grotius to bear the bonds of a felon.

July 13, 1860. J. Dare, Jun.

CORRESPONDENCE.

REV. W. HINCKS AND MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE.

SIR,

I HAVE just now enjoyed the very great pleasure of reading Mr. Ken rick's interesting Memoir of our late venerable friend, Mr. Wellbeloved and whilst cordially joining in the general feeling respecting its fidelit and beauty, I would ask permission to offer through your pages a co rection in a minor point relating to myself. It would be inferred fro Mr. Kenrick's statement (p. 198) that my having intimated my inte tion to resign the office I held in the College at the end of the sessic 1838-9, was one of the circumstances "which induced the Committe to consider very seriously the question of a change of locality." Now i fact my resignation arose from the projected change of locality. I cann now say whether what I judged necessary for myself at all hastened th crisis; but I know that I abandoned my situation after twelve yea service, and when I had no opening for a return under favourable ci cumstances to ministerial duties, very unwillingly, and only from a fu conviction that the changes then in immediate contemplation would n admit of my remaining with any advantage to myself. It is true the had as yet been no formal decision as to the plans to be adopted; b my impression is that Mr. Wellbeloved had signified the time when l wished to be relieved before I took the decisive step. I am certain th I was influenced by a belief that the College would be removed to Ma chester, not to London, and that I should not have the opportunity eith of teaching Theology, the object of my highest ambition, or with suf cient advantage to myself of continuing to teach Intellectual, Moral a Political Philosophy, without the necessity of also teaching Mathematic I felt that my duties at York had been far too extensive, and in brin ing them within reasonable bounds I would have preferred that class subjects in which I had carried on original investigations, and whi had from early years engaged much of my thoughts, to that, howev important in itself, in which I could only hope to select good books a assist the students in mastering their contents. Thinking I had suf cient reason to believe that my wishes would not be gratified, I judg it best at once to withdraw from my office, which I should not ha done had there been a prospect of Mr. Wellbeloved continuing for a time his invaluable services at York, or a reasonable probability of n obtaining anything suitable to my views in the new arrangements th in contemplation. As I have referred to my once turning my though to the Theological chair, I may be permitted perhaps to say that I w encouraged in this by Mr. Wellbeloved himself, whose kind partiali doubtless over-estimated my qualifications, and that from a very ea period critical and exegetical theology had seemed to me the pursuit which I had the best prospect as well as the strongest desire of exc ling. I readily, however, yielded to circumstances, and warmly a proved of the choice which was made. Excuse, dear Sir, my occupyi your valuable space with a personal explanation, and believe me yo constant reader and sincere friend,

Toronto, C.W., June 18, 1860. WILLIAM HINCKS.

PETER AND PAUL.

Sir,

In your last No. (June, 1860) I have read a paper upon the "*Alleged* Difference of Doctrine between Peter and Paul." Though ingenious in argument, I doubt how far it may be satisfactory in its results to the general portion of your readers. The writer very properly terms the difference between Peter and Paul an "alleged" difference; but I think he is not equally felicitous in terming it "a difference in *doctrine*," or rather in the manner of teaching the same doctrine, as he explains it. For surely no one can read Paul's account of this difference (Galat. ii.) without coming to the conclusion that it was not merely a difference of opinion between two eminent missionaries of Christ on matters not necessarily connected with the principles of Christianity, but that it was a difference, both in opinion and practice, between Paul and his opponent, which in Paul's estimation subjected his opponent to culpability, because of his unfaithfulness to the cause of Christ through the propagation of doctrines subversive of Christianity, meriting and calling forth Paul's severe rebuke, found in Galat. ii. 14 to end. This opponent of Paul's has been, indeed, "alleged" for centuries to be Peter, but without the slightest foundation, as I shall attempt to demonstrate from proof which, having accidentally been thrown in my way, has satisfied me that the adversary of Paul, alluded to in the Galatians, was not the apostle Peter, but the schismatic Cephas, referred to in 1st Corinthians.

Some time since, on perusing Conybeare and Howson's Translation and Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles, I found a note upon Gal. i. 18, wherein it is stated that in this verse "Cephas," not Peter, is the reading of some of the oldest MSS.; and not only in this verse, but in every other verse of Galatians where Peter is the present reading, excepting in ch. ii. 7, 8; and, moreover, that "Cephas" is the reading of these MSS. all through 1st Corinthians, as in our English Bibles, Peter being nowhere mentioned in that Epistle.

Applying this new rule, I subjected these two Epistles of Paul to a closer examination than formerly, and I found that it not only removes the "alleged" difference between Peter and Paul, but that it throws great light also upon various other passages in these Epistles; and not on these only, but, through them, on all the other Epistles of Paul; because, being thus led to discover that Cephas was a different person from Peter, it was easy to see, from the way in which Paul speaks of him by name both in Galatians and 1st Corinthians, that Cephas was a schismatic, a Christian heretic, one who, though appearing to be one of the pillars of the Nazarene church of Jerusalem, separated from that church to propagate, in opposition to Paul, false views of Christ's reign upon earth, grounded on the national (Luke xxiv. 21; Acts i. 6) delusion that Messiah was soon to come down from heaven and "restore the kingdom to Israel," excluding, however, all heathen converts, unless by circumcision (Acts xv. 1) they had previously become Jewish proselytes.

All this I have endeavoured fully to bring out from Paul's Epistles, aided by the Acts of the Apostles, and to set down in chronological order, in what I have termed "A Pauline History of Cephas," which, if suited to your pages, I shall be happy to send you.

In the mean time I shall conclude by shewing, under sanction of these

ancient MSS., the true reading of all the passages in Galatians wherein Peter is distinguished from Cephas.

Galatians i. 18: "Then, three years after conversion, I went up to Jerusalem to see Cephas [not Peter], and abode with him fifteen days; but of the apostles I saw none, indeed no other save James, the Lord's brother."

Galatians ii. 1, &c.: "Then, fourteen years after conversion, I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, and took Titus with me. I went up by revelation, and communicated to those who were of reputation that gospel which I preached among the Gentiles, but privately, lest by any means I should run, or had run, in vain. I told them that even Titus, whom I brought with me, though a Greek, was not compelled by me to be circumcised; and farther that we had come up because of false brethren having been brought into the church at Antioch clandestinely, to spy out the exemption from circumcision which we (heathen converts, viz. of Antioch) have through Messiah Jesus, to whom, however, I gave place, no, not for an hour, in subjecting the heathen to circumcision." Ver. 6: "But at the conference which ensued,* those persons (after named) who seemed to be somewhat (whose early membership gave them weight in the society), although whatsoever they had formerly been made no matter to me, for I knew that God (in selecting for His service) is not guided in His choice by personal influence,—those leading men made no addition to me (that is, to my gospel, as before): on the contrary (ver. 7, 8), when they perceived (from what Barnabas and I told them at the conference†) that the gospel of the uncircumcision had been committed to me, as that of the circumcision had (from an early period) been committed to Peter [not Cephas],—for God, who had hitherto wrought effectually through Peter's [not Cephas'] apostleship to the circumcision, had been mighty through my apostleship to the Gentiles: therefore (ver. 9) these leading men, who seemed like pillars of that church, namely, James, Cephas [not Peter] and John (James, the Lord's brother, Cephas, and John Mark, the nephew of Barnabas), perceiving the favour conferred upon me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, that we should continue our services to the Gentiles, and they continue theirs to the circumcision. But" (ver. 11)—at this verse, with Mr. Locke, we must understand Paul as about to tell the Galatians what led to his going up to Jerusalem fourteen years after his conversion—"when Cephas [not Peter] was at Antioch (where I found him on my return to that city with Barnabas,‡ after my first mission with him into Asia Minor), I withstood him (viz. Cephas) to the face, because he was to be blamed; for before that certain persons" (these "false brethren" lately alluded to) "came from James (as they alleged, although James denies it§), he (Cephas) did eat with the Gentile converts; but after they had come, he (Cephas) withdrew and separated himself (from the Gentile converts), fearing those of the circumcision; and the other Jewish converts dissembled likewise, insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away by their dissimulation. Therefore when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Cephas [not Peter] before them all: If thou (Cephas), being a Jewish Christian, hast hitherto conducted thyself towards Gentile con-

* Acts xv. 6. † Acts xv. 12. ‡ Acts xiv. 26—28. § Acts xv. 1, 24.

verts as any other Gentile convert would do, and hast not hitherto insisted upon circumcision by such converts, as do unconverted Jews (guided solely by the law of Moses), why dost thou now virtually compel the Gentile brethren at Antioch to become Jewish proselytes if they would unite in Christian fellowship with their Jewish brethren? We, Jewish converts, although by natural descent a portion of the peculiar people of God, and therefore not ceremonially sinners like the Gentiles, feeling assured since the advent of Messiah that a Jew has no grounds for justification and acceptance with God from undeviating adherence to the law of Moses, but through faith in Jesus as our Messiah,—even we have believed in Jesus Messiah, that we might be justified through faith in Messiah. But if while we thus seek to be justified through Messiah, we also find ourselves, regard ourselves, as sinners like the Gentiles (i.e. ceremonially unclean by Christian communion with uncircumcised Gentile converts), is not this to make Messiah the minister of sin? God forbid. For my part, should I begin to build up again the things which I have been pulling down, I should in my conscience feel myself a transgressor."

If from the readings of this second chapter of Galatians, thus corrected by these ancient MSS., we have satisfactory evidence that it was Cephas, not Peter, with whom Paul had the disagreement at Antioch, this evidence is strengthened, or confirmed rather, by a reference to Peter's speech at the Jerusalem conference to which this chapter relates:

Acts xv. 7—11: "And when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up, and said unto them, Men, my brethren (viz. Jewish), ye know how that a good while ago (by the baptism of Cornelius) God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the words of the gospel and believe; while God, who knoweth the hearts, bear them witness by giving unto them the Holy Spirit, even as unto us, and put no difference between us and them, purifying (i.e. ceremonially) their hearts by faith. Now, therefore, why should ye try God by putting a yoke upon the neck of these disciples (Gentile converts) which neither our fathers nor we (Jewish converts) are able to bear? So that we believe that, through the grace of the Lord Jesus Messiah, we shall be saved, even as they."

June 18, 1860. PETER.

GEORGE THE THIRD AND DR. PRIESTLEY.

I HAVE read a communication from George III. to one of his Ministers on the subject of the riots in which Priestley's house was burned. His Majesty says, in his short, emphatic way, that the riots must be stopped immediately, that no man's house must be left in peril; and then he orders the march of certain troops, &c., to restore peace; and concludes with saying, that as the mischief did occur, it was impossible not to be pleased at its having fallen on Priestley rather than another, that he might *feel* the wickedness of the doctrines of democracy which he was propagating.—*Croker, quoted by Cunningham, Walpole's Letters*, IX. 406.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Roman Sepulcral Inscriptions: their Relation to Archæology, Language and Religion. By John Kenrick, M.A., F.S.A. London—John Russell Smith. 1858.

We have too long delayed our intention to notice this extremely interesting volume. It originated in two papers, read before the Yorkshire Philosophical Society, designed, the author tells us, "to direct the attention of the members to the monuments preserved in their own Museum, and at the same time to shew how the labours of the antiquary connect themselves with the history of manners, institutions and opinions. The subject, I believe, has not been specially treated of in this country before; and as the remains of antiquity are now studied with more enlarged views than in a former age, it may have an interest for a wider circle than that to which the original papers were addressed."

We feel greatly indebted to Mr. Kenrick for putting his papers into this shape. They form a volume of but 70 pages,—full, however, of most instructive illustration,—the table of contents indicating the points of interest. One or two of these we shall adduce, reserving our chief space, however, for the religious bearing of the subject.

How long have we been in arriving at the ancient wisdom! It was the prohibition of the twelve tables, *Hominem mortuum in urbe ne sepelito neve urito.*—P. 6.

"It was the all but universal practice in the ancient world to inter the bodies or ashes of the dead beyond the limits of the cities. Even in Egypt, where the practice of embalmment might have rendered it safe to retain them in the vicinity of the living, the cemeteries of the great cities were placed on the opposite side of the Nile."—P. 5.

"The principal roads at Rome seem to have been lined with sepulcres for a considerable distance, especially the Appian, the 'Regina Viarum' as it is termed by Statius.* Atticus was buried at the fifth milestone from the city on this road, Gallienus at the ninth.† No urn or sarcophagus has been found within the walls of Roman York, but the traces of interment begin immediately beyond the gates."—P. 6.

The frequency of the sepulcral lamp (p. 16) suggests to our minds its perhaps original emblematic hope. The complaint that "physicians were in vain," is of ancient date.‡—P. 19.

"Pliny has not preserved the name of the unhappy man whose monument declared, *turba medicorum se periisse*, that he had died of a multitude of doctors."§—P. 19.

One interesting part of the volume gives instances of inscriptions "which throw light on the history of the Latin language, or illustrate that vulgar idiom and pronunciation which has influenced the formation of the modern Italian." We have the "Hic jac*it*," the counterpart of our rustic English, "Here *lays*." "'Poor letter *h*,' too, was treated with the same barbarous caprice of old as now, being omitted where it should stand, and interpolated where it should not. Those who omit the aspirate, however, are always more numerous than those who insert it: in Italy they ultimately gained the ascendancy, and it is banished

* Sylv. 2, 2, 13.
† C. Nep. Att. 22.
‡ Gruter, p. 340.
§ Nat. Hist. 29, 1.

in pronunciation from modern Italian, which follows in this respect the usage of the old Romans, who said *ædos* and *ircos*."*

The difference of manners and customs between the ancient and modern world is curiously illustrated in the humble station in life not being withheld from the epitaph. The dealer in pigs, *negotiator suarius*, the female greengrocer, *negotiatrix frumentaria et leguminaria*, occurs. Above all, *stupidus gregis urbani*, the clown of the city company of mountebanks,† so designates himself on the tomb of his wife.—P. 25.

"It would not be mentioned now on the tomb of a medical practitioner, that he had begun by practising his art in many market-places "*fora multa secutus.*"‡

Further on, Mr. Kenrick quotes an inscription of a higher kind, which, he well observes, for its expressive simplicity might be placed on the monument of a Macready: *Ingenuum comœdum, propter singularem artis prudentiam et morum probitatem.*

The latter part of the volume becomes naturally of deeper interest, since it treats of the light the inscriptions throw on the social relations, the domestic affections and the religious belief of the people of whom they are the record. The language of genuine sorrow, the writer truly observes, is simple and concise; and this appears to have been the distinctively Roman. A beautiful instance is given in the title-page of the book. Many others are adduced. Amongst other sentiments, such as that which Sydney Smith expressed on the tomb of his son Douglas, "His death was the first sorrow he ever occasioned his parents," frequently occurs.

"We learn," says Mr. Kenrick (p. 38), from the sepulcral inscriptions that the Romans had the same familiar substitutes as ourselves for the formal appellations of father and mother, *mamma* and *tata*," as well as their diminutives.

"In one instance§ a man erects a monument to his aged *bonne, Nonnæ suæ.* The word is not found in classical Latinity; but it is the undoubted origin of *nun*, and may suggest that conventual vows were originally taken chiefly by aged females. In Italy at the present day it is the familiar name for grandmother."—P. 38.

We give our remaining space to the religious bearing of inscriptions.

"In those inscriptions which enter into a fuller enumeration of public services, one difference is striking to a person accustomed to modern ones, namely, the absence in the former of all mention of acts of social benevolence. It is true that the erection of a fountain, the construction of a road, the dedication of a temple, the exhibition of gladiatorial and floral games, the bequest of a legacy for an annual feast, and similar acts of popular munificence, are often commemorated, as titles of honour; but I do not remember to have met with a record, originating in Pagan times, of a life devoted to the alleviation of misery, to the relief of indigence, to the removal of ignorance and vice. Such virtues belong especially to the school of Christianity. The following inscription would be proved by its tenor to relate to a Christian woman, even if the date did not fix it to the middle of the fifth century of our era: *Deo fidelis, dulcis marito, nutrix familiæ, cunctis humilis, placato puro corde, amatrix pauperum.*"‖—Pp. 35, 36.

---

* Quinct. 1, 5, 20.

† Orelli, 2645.

‡ Spon. Misc. p. 143. There has been a great controversy respecting the medical men of Rome, whether they were slaves; the monuments shew them to have been commonly Greek freedmen.

§ Orelli, 2815.

‖ Orelli, 4657.

Again, p. 48:

"One remarkable contrast strikes us on comparing ancient with modern, Heathen with Christian inscriptions—the entire absence in the former of anything like resignation to the will of a Superior Power, or any acknowledgment of a benevolent purpose in a painful dispensation. If the gods are alluded to, it is in the way of complaint. *Manus lebo* (levo) *contra deum qui me innocentem sustulit,** is a bold defiance of Providence."

Upon the belief of the Romans respecting the condition of man after death, Mr. Kenrick observes (p. 52), that the almost universal commencement of epitaphs with Diis Manibus, or the abbreviation D.M., might seem to indicate an universal belief in the continued existence of the spiritual part of his nature; but how far the formulary may be taken as a proof of the continuance of the belief, is a question very difficult to decide. He cites inscriptions of varying character, yet the preponderance is in the doubting key. "*Si* quis," said even Tacitus of Agricola, "piorum Manibus locus; si, ut sapientibus placet, non cum corpore extinguuntur magnæ animæ, placide quiescas."

"Upon the whole," Mr. Kenrick concludes, "the evidence, negative even more than positive, of the Roman sepulcral inscriptions, abundantly confirms the testimony of Heathen as well as Christian writers to the absence of any definite and practical belief in a future state in the three or four first centuries after the Christian era. Yet few would be able tranquilly to acquiesce in the doctrine of annihilation. They sought in other sources for that assurance which neither religion nor philosophy could afford them. Never was the practice of magic, incantations, necromancy and mysteries more prevalent than during the period in which Christianity was slowly supplanting the ancient superstitions. It was evident that the fulness of the times was come, and that if the world were not to be divided between the victims of religious imposture and the disciples of Epicurus, light from on high must visit the earth."—P. 56.

"Other inscriptions," Mr. K. continues, "not properly sepulcral, afford the same proof of the loss of all vital power in the old religion." A remarkable proof is, that among all the religious monuments which the Museum of the Yorkshire Philosophical Society contains, there is not one to any of the great gods of the popular creed, while there are several to the gods of the barbarians, showing that the popular religion was altogether "a creed outworn," and men were seeking something else.

"Art," he says—and the remark has its lesson among ourselves now—"Art had familiarized men with the human representations of their deities, and even by the perfection of its visible and material works had destroyed the belief in their spiritual existence and invisible power. Philosophy had exposed the folly of an anthropomorphic polytheism; poetry and the stage had made the gods contemptible. Nothing was left which could awaken reverence and love: instead of aiding, the popular religion checked the impulse of the mind to connect the ideas of infinitude and deity. But in the gods of the barbarous nations, who had remained without art, and without a mythology converting gods into men, there was something obscure, mysterious and indefinite; something on which imagination could fasten, and which it could readily invest with supernatural attributes. He who looked on the Apollo of the Belvedere with no other feeling than that he beheld the triumph of the sculptor's art in action and expression, was overcome with a religious awe

* Gruter, p. 820. The hands uplifted in protest are sculptured on the monument.

when he gazed on the unmeaning faces and half-bestial forms of Egyptian deities. The genius of Rome was tolerant of all religions but the true; a hearty belief in the gods of his own Pantheon would not have prevented a Roman soldier from doing homage to those of the country in which he was quartered, and seeking thus to gain their favour or avert their displeasure. But this will not account for the extensive diffusion of the worship of Phrygia and Thrace, Persia and Egypt, throughout the Roman empire. It was certainly an indication of a restless longing for something that could supply nourishment to the craving for religious faith which exists in the heart of man, and feeds itself on superstition when it can find no purer aliment."—P. 58.

Such being the state of the general Roman mind, what a prophecy do we not read in it of the coming nations of the North,—what a testimony to that Providence which was preparing the one for the other!

We make no apology for the following concluding extract:

"Among the sights of modern Rome is none more interesting than that long gallery of the Vatican called *Delle Lapidi*. On the right-hand wall are encased the sepulcral and other monuments of emperors, consuls and commanders of legions, with their numerous and pompous titles,—inscriptions to the gods and their priests. The elaborate and tasteful ornaments, the finely-cut letters, the classical Latinity—all indicate the rank and station of those by whom or in whose honour they were raised. On the left are the Christian monuments, chiefly supplied by the Catacombs, which, during the ages of the obscurity and persecution of the Church, served the Christians for sanctuary and cemetery, and even for a temporary dwelling-place. The slabs from their tombs are of coarse material—not Parian, or Carrara marble, or Egyptian porphyry; the letters are rudely made, the spelling and the syntax betray the humble rank and imperfect literary attainments of those who supplied them. No mention is made of ample space allotted to the tomb, no anxious care is expressed to perpetuate the inheritance or provide for a long succession of occupants. The Christian perhaps fell asleep in the expectation that the second coming of his Lord, to call the tenants of the tomb to judgment, would not be delayed beyond a few years. The Roman of family had three names; the Christian had no *gens* with which to claim affinity; he was a proletarian, a mere unit amidst the millions. One simple name served to identify him; his sepulcre might even be nameless—a circumstance of rare occurrence in regard to Pagan tombs.* How strikingly does the contrast confirm the declaration of the apostle, that 'not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble were called.'† But to this contrast there is another side. The Heathen monuments represent a decayed and dying superstition; the Christian, a living and triumphant faith—'the weak things of the world chosen to confound the strong.' Their inscriptions speak of resignation, peace and confidence; their emblems, the Good Shepherd, the Dove, the Anchor, the Ark of Noah, all breathe the same peaceful, humble, and yet hopeful spirit." Pp. 58, 59. R.

Physiology for Common Schools, in Twenty-seven Easy Lessons. By Mrs. Charles Bray. London—Longman, Green & Co. 1860.

Among the marked improvements of our time is the great change for the better which has taken place in the style and matter of books meant for young people and for common schools. Among the earliest reformers in this line, we believe, was Miss Edgeworth in her Popular Tales, &c. We ought never in this connection to forget that admirable little work, which can hardly be superseded, "Evenings at Home," by Mrs. Barbauld and her brother, Dr. Aikin. Peter Parley, just deceased, Miss

* Fabretti, p. 545. † Maitland, Church in the Catacombs, p. 10.

Sedgwick, Mrs. Follen, Harriet Martineau, have all done excellent service in this way, as well as a host of others. And now we welcome Mrs. Bray into the same goodly company of labourers for the right training of the youthful mind. This unpretending little volume of 112 pages, divided into twenty-seven lessons, contains nothing like profound knowledge nor minute detail. If this had been attempted, the little book would have been less adapted to the purpose in view, namely, to convey some plain instructions on the preservation of health to the children of the poor who attend our common schools. "This small work," says the author in her Preface, "is chiefly intended as a lesson-book in our common schools, and is an attempt to make intelligible to the children of the poorer classes so much of the nature of the vital organs and functions as shall give them some correct ideas with respect to the means by which disease may be avoided and health preserved." The language of this little manual is simple, the statements clear, the lessons important, and the physiological science correct. It would be useful in the hands of Sunday-school teachers who feel it a duty to impart secular knowledge on a Sunday, and who may think that any sound instruction respecting the works of God can hardly be classed as "godless education," or a desecration of the sacred day of rest and worship. Some acquaintance with the structure and functions of the human body is now felt to be requisite in our common schools. And we have visited schools in Edinburgh and London where such knowledge is effectively imparted. There is nothing strange in this. The strange thing is, that this want should not have been felt long ago. Here are we bearing about living bodies, placed in relation to various mechanical and chemical agents around us, yet how few of us have given ourselves the trouble to acquire any proper knowledge how we should regulate that wondrous living mechanism, which may be affected favourably or otherwise by air, light, heat, food, drink, stimulants, mental feelings, and a thousand other causes. Chemistry and mechanical science are considered essential parts of a liberal education. Inconsistently enough, physiology is only beginning to be so regarded; yet physiology comes home to men's business and bosoms not less than chemistry or the knowledge of mechanics. In the co-ordination of the sciences, physiology stands higher than chemistry—living tissue above dead matter; though, from the greater complexity of its phenomena, it must be necessarily less advanced, less understood, than chemistry or any of the sciences of unorganized matter. Every one who desires to possess a sound mind in a sound body will be benefited by acquaintance with the class of important facts and lessons to which Mrs. Bray's little volume calls attention.

The very headings of the lessons are suggestive and stimulating to the curiosity of young people; such as, "Why must we take Food? Why must we wash ourselves? Why must we keep our Rooms well aired? How is the whole of the Body fed? The Teeth. What is Thirst? A Peep into the Stomach. Why do we breathe? How to keep the Blood pure and healthy. When is Cold dangerous? Mischief of Tight Clothing. Disease of the Body often causes Disease of the Mind." Each of these topics is treated with remarkable perspicuity and brevity, in language which may be easily understood by children of eight or ten years of age. And as we are all but children of a larger

growth and only a little wider experience, there are lessons and principles here taught which older persons would do well to heed.

We extract a few specimens of the style and simplicity of the thought.

"If you could look inside your bodies, you would see that there must be a constant wearing away of every part, because every part is in constant motion. Put your hand to your side and you will feel your heart beat; put your finger to your wrist and you will feel your blood running along; and although the motion in some parts is too fine to be felt or seen, yet there is no rest anywhere in a living body, and change and motion go on always inside us, whether we are awake or asleep, whether we stand still or move about.

"Now wherever there is motion, there must be wear and waste. In an engine or a machine, the parts are always wearing away by rubbing against each other, and the faster they move the faster they wear away. It is the same in the living body; the faster the motion of the parts, and the more we exert ourselves and move our bodies and work our limbs, the faster the wear and waste goes on, and the more food is required to make up the loss. We want, therefore, a certain quantity of food every day to keep the life within us. . . . . But the wearing away that goes on in a living body is not like the wearing away of machinery; it is more like the burning away of fuel in the fire. Part of the coal that has been burned and done with turns to gas and goes up the chimney; in something like the same manner the parts of our body that have given out their nourishment and are done with turn to breath and perspiration, and go off from our bodies.

"The breath comes away out of our mouth and nose. The perspiration comes away through the little holes or pores in the skin, which are too small to be seen except through a microscope, but which lie close together all over the surface of the body."—Pp. 4, 5.

On p. 7, the reason is shewn why cleanliness is so essential to health, and, as a good man once said, next to godliness. Some people think they have done their duty by their bodies in the matter of cleanliness, if they drench the cheeks and the tip of the nose; they forget that the whole surface of the body transmits perspiration, and therefore no one can be really clean, sweet and healthy, who does not wash regularly the whole body. The simple method of using a rough towel dipped in water and applied over the whole body, is now extensively practised by the middle classes, might be used by the working classes, is recommended by medical men, would save expensive apparatus for bathing, and would be a powerful promoter of health by promoting cleanliness.

"About ten years ago, some people who were coming over from Ireland to Liverpool in a steam-packet lost their lives entirely because the captain of the vessel did not consider how dangerous it is to breathe the breath over again. As the captain saw that a storm was coming on, he ordered all the passengers to go below into the cabin. Now this cabin was much too small for all the persons that were crowded into it; and when they were all down, the captain thoughtlessly ordered the hatches or openings at the top to be fastened down and the entrance to be close shut. Of course no fresh air could get in, and so the poor passengers had to breathe over and over again the same air. Their sufferings were dreadful, and they tried all they could to get out. At last one of them forced his way up to the deck and told the mate how the passengers were being suffocated. When the mate went down, he found that 70 were dead and many were dying. Those who survived had fever."—P. 8.

Sound information and good advice are given respecting the teeth. Many diseases are connected with indigestion, and indigestion is connected with the unclean and improper condition of the teeth.

"The enamel is liable to decay if it is not kept perfectly clean. Any little

the knives and forks dirty to leave dirty these living implement mouths.

"The teeth should be well cleaned with a tooth-brush and wat night before going to bed, and again in the morning—at any ra morning. There is nothing so disgusting to look at as dirty teeth; and they make the breath smell disagreeable. Children often destroy th by constantly eating unwholesome things, such as pastry and sweetm unripe fruits. If too many of these are eaten, the stomach becomes dis and a disordered stomach usually makes the teeth rotten."—P. 16.

From the living blood are built up all the living tissues of th and the waste repaired and the strength renewed. The auth not go out of her way to be always pointing to marvels in the e art of nature's works, but on proper occasions she does not fail t to that faculty of wonder so strong in all young minds.

"Can anything be more wonderful than that dead flesh and dead ve and water and bread and substances that have no life in themselves when once taken into our body, turn into living flesh, living bon skin! And is it not also most wonderful that all the different kind that we eat, whether it is a piece of beef or a piece of bread, wheth cupful of milk or a handful of gooseberries—all turn into just the sa of living fluid! The piece of beef contains much *more* nourishment gooseberries, but exactly the same kind of blood is made from both.

"The stomach begins the work of digestion by changing the foo grey-coloured, pulpy substance called chyme.

"The stomach looks something like a large leathern bottle with tw ings,—one for the food to come in at down the gullet, and the othe digested food or chyme to go out into the intestines. The stomach will hold about three pints."—P. 26.

After a sufficient meal, the stomach requires to be let alone or six hours before putting anything more into it. Children re be fed at shorter intervals, but the sensation of real, unmist hunger is a good, wholesome one, which upgrown persons shoul least once or twice a day. Hunger is a short illness occurring a intervals, and which may be most pleasantly cured every da

to be kept from eating till they are hungry, and it is a bad practice to be always giving them something to eat to amuse them and to keep them quiet, as some mothers and nurses do, who do not like to take the trouble of keeping them good-tempered by better means.

"By this constant eating, the child will lose its appetite for the proper meals; his stomach will most likely become weak, and it will be dainty about its food, and perhaps sickly and fretful, and so will give its mother a great deal more trouble in the end than if she had not spoilt it by this sort of over-indulgence.

"A poor ragged beggar-woman, with a child in her arms, once begged at a house-door for something to eat, as she said her child was starving. The lady of the house brought the child a piece of bread and butter; but the child pushed it away and began to cry. The lady asked what was the matter. 'Oh, ma'am!' said the woman, 'you see the poor darling never will eat bread and butter unless there's some sugar on it.' The lady put some sugar on it, but she thought it a sad pity that a woman who was obliged to beg her bread had made her child so dainty."—P. 33.

Lesson 13th bears a very stimulating title; it is called "A Peep into the Stomach;" and, in language so simple that a child may understand it, conveys information that may profit older people.

"You will perhaps wonder how people have been able to find out what goes on in the stomach, since we cannot look in and see. About thirty-seven years ago, a strange accident that happened to a young man in Canada actually enabled an American physician, Dr. Beaumont, to look into a living stomach and see what goes on.

"The name of this young man was Alexis St. Martin, and he had a hole made in his stomach by the discharge of a gun which went off only at about a yard's distance from him. The young man was very ill, and suffered a great deal of pain for about a year after the accident; but at last, through the skill and care of Dr. Beaumont, he got well again; but the hole in his stomach, which was nearly as large as a half-crown, never closed. Dr. Beaumont was thus able to look inside, and he has written a book in which he tells all that he saw and found out about the digestion of the food. He saw, amongst other things, that when a mouthful of food was swallowed, the stomach closed upon it directly, and by its churning motion spread it all over the inside, so that the gastric juice mixed with every part; and as soon as it had done this, the stomach opened wide again the passage into the gullet, ready for the next mouthful. If the next mouthful came down too soon and before the passage was open, the stomach squeezed up the opening still more tightly to prevent its opening. If it was *forced* to open too soon by the mouthfuls coming down too fast one after another, the motion of the stomach was seen to get irregular and disturbed, and the food did not digest well."—P. 38.

We ought not to omit to state that at the end of each chapter or lesson questions with answers are appended, so as to call attention to the leading principles taught. The teacher who properly uses this little manual will insensibly but irresistibly instil into the minds of children the perception that the living universe is governed by divine, universal and invariable laws; thus counteracting a wide-spread but silly and superstitious notion that no laws are divine, that no principles are invested with the highest authority, unless they are found written in a book, expressed in human language. By dwelling on the facts and principles involved in our own living frames, the habit may be early formed of studying the works of nature, using eyes, ears and understanding, and passing by nothing as too trivial for notice. The importance of little things is a lesson that needs to be often impressed on the youthful mind.

And the familiar and ever-recurring facts of our own bodies seem well adapted to convey that lesson. Every one now-a-days is aware of the importance of pure air, clean water, bathing, a skin in good order, &c.

"Of late years, clever men who have given themselves a great deal of trouble to find out how the poor can be saved from so much suffering and illness, have invented ways of building houses, so that enough fresh air is let into them without their being cold and damp; and factories, school-rooms and hospitals built in this way are not the close, wretched places they used to be. Houses for the poor are beginning to be built in the same way; and we may hope that in some years' time every working man may find a house to live in where the air can be kept pure, at the same time that it is warm and comfortable.

"Here we see how useful knowledge may be made, and how much the men who think and contrive can help those who have to labour with their hands more than their heads. There was once a time in England when the people were content to live in huts made of mud or clay, with no fire-places, chimneys or windows, and with only a hole in the roof to let the smoke out, and a hole at the side to serve as entrance and to let the air and light in. Now in these days, thanks to those who have used their brains well for the good of others, the cottage of the poorest man has more comforts in it than the palace of the king some hundred years ago. But in whatever way houses are built, and whether they belong to the rich or the poor, the comfort and health inside them depend a great deal upon the sort of people who live in them. We may go into many a poor man's house and find it more sweet and clean and pleasant to live in than some very grand houses where there are plenty of servants to do the work and plenty of money to spend. And we may go also into many houses, big and little, where the bad air and sickening smells almost drive us out again, because the people who live in them are dirty in their habits and ignorant of the value of pure air.

"If you ever grow up to have homes and families of your own, and have very little money to spend upon food and clothing and other comforts, you can still make the best of these two cheap luxuries, fresh air and water. You can change the air constantly in your bed-rooms and other rooms; even in winter time you can open the windows at least once a day, when there is no one there to take cold from it; and you can keep your houses clean, and your skins and clothes clean, and clear away quickly everything that is dirty and that can taint the air; so that at least you and your children may have wholesome air to breathe, if they cannot have many other things that they need." P. 73. A. M.

The Hills and Plains of Palestine, with Illustrations and Descriptions. By Miss L. M. Cubley. Small folio. Pp. 56. London—Day and Son. 1860.

This beautiful volume was the result of a visit to the Holy Land, in the latter months of 1853, by the accomplished authoress. She was led there by the desire of co-operating in a benevolent scheme which had in view the raising the condition of the poor Jewesses in Jerusalem. The sketches which are reproduced in this volume are executed with admirable taste, are evidently as truthful as they are beautiful, and are invaluable to those who wish to make up for the want of personal inspection of the Holy Land by the delineations of art. The descriptions which accompany the plates are extracts from Miss Cubley's diary and letters. They have not, however, the power and interest of the engravings.

INTELLIGENCE.

MEETING AT OXFORD TO INAUGURATE THE STATUE OF DR. PRIESTLEY IN THE UNIVERSITY MUSEUM.

The erection of the new Museum at Oxford is an event which must command the approbation of the wise and good. Most commendable is the spirit in which the authorities of the University have entered on, and to a considerable extent fulfilled, their generous purpose of aiding the study of natural science and doing honour to the memory of the great founders and improvers of scientific knowledge. Liberal as the supply of funds has been by the University to the Delegacy to whom the work is entrusted, it has been found necessary to appeal to private generosity to supply the interior ornaments of the building. The appeal is being well answered. Already five statues have been presented by the Queen, viz., those of Bacon, Galileo, Newton, Leibnitz and Oersted; the Bachelors and Undergraduates have furnished the statues of Aristotle and Cuvier; Mr. Ruskin has given that of Hippocrates; the Marquis of Lothian that of Davy; the Rev. F. W. Hope, D.C.L., that of Linnæus; Mr. Boulton that of Watt; Mr. H. Vaughan that of Harvey; the Freemasons of the province of Oxfordshire that of Euclid. Our pages have already detailed the proceedings which led to the provision of a statue of Priestley. It was a happy circumstance that the zeal of the London Committee, ably seconded by that of Mr. Stephens, the sculptor to whom they entrusted the work, succeeded in procuring and erecting the statue in its appointed place, at the S.W. corner of the Museum, between the statues of Aristotle and Davy, in time for the thirtieth meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science. The statue naturally attracted a large amount of attention from the numerous visitors in Oxford. At the series of brilliant soirées held in the Museum, it was again and again the subject of remark, and gave general satisfaction, but especially to those who were familiar by report and the help of busts and pictures with the features and expression of the great philosopher. It was thought desirable to mark the occasion by a social gathering during the week of the scientific congress, and Tuesday, July 3, was the day selected. On that occasion a large party assembled at breakfast in the Star Hotel, composed of the ladies and gentlemen whose names follow:

The Baron Anca, of Palermo; N. Arnott, Esq., M.D., Mrs. Arnott; Thos. Ashton, Esq., M.D., Manchester; Rev. R. Brook Aspland, M.A.; B. C. Brodie, Esq., Professor of Chemistry in the University of Oxford and President of the Chemical Section; Rev. Samuel Bache, Birmingham; G. Bowdler Buckton, Esq., F.R.S., London; Eddowes Bowman, Esq., Manchester; Mary Carpenter, Bristol; J. L. Cappitain, Esq., London; Edward Cotton, Esq., London; John Davy, Esq., M.D., F.R.S., Ambleside; John W. Draper, Esq., M.D., Professor of Chemistry, University, New York; Rev. David Davis, Norwich; Rd. Dowden, Esq., Cork; J. C. Darbishire, Esq., Rivington; Hugh Falconer, Esq., M.D., F.R.S., F.L.S., London; G. C. Foster, Esq., of Sabden and Exeter College; William Francis, Esq., London; Frank Fellows, Esq.; John Gibbs, Esq., Tamworth; J. Stuart Glennie, Esq.; H. Hatch, Esq., Oxford; W. Charles Henry, Esq., M.D., F.R.S., Haffield; Jas. Heywood, Esq., F.R.S., London; Robt. Heywood, Esq., Bolton; Rev. Thos. Hincks, F.L.S., Leeds; Leonard Horner, Esq., F.R.S., London, President of Geological Society; R. Vernon Harcourt, Esq., Scholar of Christchurch, Oxford, and Secretary of Chemical Section; Miss E. Vernon Harcourt; Rev. Edward Higginson, Swansea; Rev. William James, Bristol; Rev. John Kenrick, M.A., York; Rev. Edmund Kell, M.A., Southampton; Rev. Thomas Kirkman, M.A., F.R.S., Rector of Croft; J. D. Liveing, Esq., M.A., Oxford, Secretary of the Chemical Section; John Lee, Esq., LL.D., F.S.A., Aylesbury; Arthur Lupton, Esq., Leeds; Ivie Mackie, Esq., Mayor of Manchester; James M'Connel, Esq., Manchester, Mrs. M'Connel; Chas. Moore, Esq., F.G.S., Bath; Herbert New, Esq., Evesham; Dennison Nayler, Esq., Altringham; Follet Osler, Esq., Birmingham; Rev. B. Price, F.R.S., Sedleian Professor, Oxford; Mr. H. D. Pochin, Salford; W. O. Priestley, Esq., M.D., London; Wm. Russell, Esq., and Arthur Ryland, Esq., Birmingham; John Shuttleworth, Esq., Manchester, Mrs. Shuttleworth; Brooke Smith, Esq., Birmingham; E. B. Stephens, Esq., London; Professor Verdet, Paris; Rev. Robert Walker, Professor of Natural Philosophy and one of the Sub-delegates of the Museum; Rev. G. Walker; Chas. Wheatstone, Esq., F.R.S., Professor of Experimental Philosophy, King's College, London; James Yates, Esq., F.R.S., &c., Highgate, Mrs. Yates; Dr. Zumpt, Berlin.

The chair was filled by Professor Brodie, at whose right hand sat Dr. Davy, brother

of the late Sir Humphry Davy, and Dr. W. Charles Henry; and on his left, Professor Walker, one of the Sub-delegacy, and Professor Price, of Oxford. The vice-chair was filled by Mr. James Yates.

In opening the business, the CHAIRMAN said, however interesting they might be, their proceedings must necessarily, in deference to other duties which would soon call them away, be very brief, but he could not allow the occasion to pass over without making a few observations. And first of all he wished to offer his own thanks, and those of the University to which he belonged, to those gentlemen who had combined to enrich and adorn their Museum with the statue of Dr. Priestley. The two facts which had occasioned their meeting that day were in themselves sufficiently remarkable: first, that a place was assigned in the Museum to the statue of Dr. Priestley; and next, that a body of gentlemen were so promptly found willing to undertake the duty of placing the statue there. These things were satisfactory. They indicated the extinction of a great deal of party feeling; they told them that many unworthy sentiments had altogether died out. Dr. Priestley was a man of wonderful versatility. He was a great philosopher; but, in addition, he was an active politician and he was an eminent theologian. He distinguished himself not only in the calm pursuits of philosophy, but in a variety of other pursuits, in some of which the opinions and feelings of mankind are particularly excitable and sensitive. It required the lapse of a generation or two before such a man could take his rightful position. But even after the lapse of years a truly great man seldom received the honour that was his due; when his claims were recognized, he still received the homage of only half the race whom his wisdom benefited. We hold in the highest honour the memory of PRIESTLEY. He was the true founder of Pneumatic Chemistry. His name is honourably recorded in the annals of English science during the latter portion of the last century, a period marked by many great and brilliant discoveries. Amongst the names of those to whom early chemical science is indebted—Black, Cavendish, Lavoisier—we can place none higher than that of Priestley. To shew that reverence for Priestley's philosophical character was with him no new sentiment, he would read to them (at the suggestion of a member of the Committee) a passage from a lecture which he had formerly delivered in that University. A friend had remarked to him in regard to that lecture, after its delivery, that it was the first time the name of Priestley had ever been mentioned in Oxford with This was not strictly true; for he his predecessor in the chair of Che Dr. Daubeny, had not failed to justice to the merits of Priestley.

"Without a knowledge of gases theory of chemistry was impossibl data did not exist for its const The very facts were unknown for v should account. No knowledge subject was bequeathed to chemist alchemists; their discovery was for a late period in the science, and diately upon this discovery the true of chemistry was invented.

"Up to the time of Priestley gases were known: hydrogen, an in knowledge of which, under the inflammable air, had descended fro times; and carbonic acid, the disc which was announced by Black, young man of twenty-one, in the ye in his inaugural discourse at G And it was only recently that had become acquainted with the pr even of these gases. No methods h known for their collection and e tion, and no exact experiments h made with them. About this apparatus of an extreme simplic invented for the collection of gases goes under the name of the pn trough, and which is used at the day without any essential variatio construction. By means of this ap Priestley made a series of more rem discoveries in chemistry than had been made by one man, discoverie astonished Europe and changed th aspect of science.

"On the 1st of August, 1774,- preserve the record of a day so me in the history of mankind,—Pries covered oxygen gas. Nor did th very stand alone. Priestley also di nitrogen, the second constituent He discovered the binoxide of nitr means of which the first analysi was made. He discovered hydr acid gas, ammonia, sulphurous ac gen, the crown of these discover last of all. Strange to say, thes veries formed but a little episod life; he does not appear as a s observer until thirty-two years of his researches extend only thro years. When in future ages me up the names of the benefactors race, the names of those who foundations of the sciences by wl condition of humanity has been among the most famous will be fo name of Priestley."

What he had now read to them

recommendation. His words were not a mere éloge of Priestley, prepared with a view of pleasing an assembly of his friends and admirers, but they were the genuine sentiments of one speaking on behalf of science and desirous of doing honour to a true philosopher. He would conclude his remarks by proposing from the chair, and he did it from his heart, the following resolution: "That the thanks of the meeting be given to Mr. Yates and the other members of the Committee for their zealous and successful labours in erecting the statue of Dr. Priestley."

Dr. DAVY, rose, he said, with great pleasure to second the resolution. Little need be added to the just and forcible sentiments to which they had just listened from their Chairman. He must, however, express his warm admiration of the statue which the Committee had caused to be executed, and which was one of the many beautiful ornaments of the new Museum. When he (Dr. Davy) was invited as a guest to that breakfast, he felt it to be a great honour. He remembered with great interest a letter addressed to his brother, the late Sir Humphry Davy. That letter was written in the first year of the present century from the United States, to which Dr. Priestley was under the necessity of flying from the disgraceful persecution of which he was the object in his own country, his house and library and apparatus at Birmingham having been destroyed by a ferocious mob.

"Northumberland, U.S.,
Oct. 31, 1801.

"Sir,—I have read with admiration your excellent publications, and have received much instruction from them. It gives me peculiar satisfaction that, as I am now far advanced in life and cannot expect to do much more, I shall leave so able a fellow-labourer of my own country in the great field of experimental chemistry. As old an experimenter as I am, I was near forty before I made any experiments on the subject of air, and then without, in a manner, any previous knowledge of chemistry. This I picked up as I could, and as I found occasion for it from books. I was also without apparatus, and laboured under many other disadvantages. But my unexpected success induced the friends of science to assist me, and then I wanted for nothing. I rejoice that you are so young a man, and perceiving the ardour with which you begin your career, I have no doubt of your success."

He could not but think it most remarkable that a man at Dr. Priestley's time of life, with little previous knowledge of chemistry, should have achieved such brilliant discoveries. It seemed almost as if he had been inspired. Certainly, looking at his means and previous acquirements, no one could have anticipated the result. He seconded the resolution with much cordiality. It was unanimously adopted.

Mr. YATES, in acknowledging the vote so handsomely proposed by the Chairman and seconded by Dr. Davy, expressed the great delight which that meeting gave him. To see such an assemblage of distinguished men, and to hear the noble sentiments which had been uttered, was a most agreeable close of the labours of the Committee. It was not his purpose to dilate on the great merits of Priestley. Mr. Yates then described the circumstances which had led to the formation of the Committee, and mentioned with respect the name of Mr. Kent Kingdon, of Exeter, to whom belonged the merit of having suggested and commenced the subscription. He (Mr. Y.) regretted that Mr. K. was not present, but the company would be gratified to hear a passage from a letter lately received in respect to the statue: "I am quite satisfied; Priestley's character and attainments are now publicly recognized by the highest seat of learning in the world. The exiled from his country is received back again, and takes his place with the selected great and wise of all nations." The proposal to raise the statue had found favour with men of all sects and parties. It had an immediate and gratifying response from scientific men. At Birmingham, where the memory of Priestley was reverently cherished, the plan was warmly adopted, and he desired to mention the assistance given him by the Rev. Samuel Bache, the minister who now occupied the pulpit of Priestley. From Birmingham and other places he had received subscriptions from persons of various ranks,—some with no particular pretensions to science, but persons who knew how to respect genius, and who loved virtue wherever it was found. He was pleased to observe the presence of the Sculptor who had with such zeal and singular ability carried out the wishes of the Committee. They had furnished him with the best materials, and the result was an admirable likeness. In the statue, Priestley appeared in the ordinary costume of his age. In the pulpit, he had a different costume. Mr. Yates further alluded to the painted portraits, busts, medallions and engravings from which Mr. Stephens had worked, and alluded to the pleasure it had given him, at a recent soirée of the Royal Society, to exhibit at Burlington House these various memorials to Sir B.

Brodie, the President of that Society (the father of their Chairman) and to his distinguished guests. Mr. Yates then delivered with admirable propriety the noted tribute borne to Dr. Priestley by his neighbour, acquaintance and friend, Dr. Parr, and published in an Address to the Inhabitants of Birmingham:

"Let Dr. Priestley, indeed, be confuted where he is mistaken. Let him be exposed where he is superficial. Let him be repressed where he is dogmatical. Let him be rebuked where he is censorious. But let not his attainments be depreciated, because they are numerous almost without a parallel. Let not his talents be ridiculed, because they are superlatively great. Let not his morals be vilified, because they are correct without austerity, and exemplary without ostentation—because they present even to common observers the innocence of a Hermit and the simplicity of a Patriarch, and because a philosophic eye will at once discover in them the deep-fixed root of virtuous principle, and the solid trunk of virtuous habit."

Mr. Yates concluded by proposing a vote of thanks to Professor Brodie for his valuable assistance as the Chairman of the meeting.

Rev. JOHN KENRICK then rose, at the request of the Committee, to propose this resolution — "That the thanks of this meeting be given to the Authorities of the University of Oxford connected with the new Museum, for their justice alike to Science and to the memory of a distinguished Philosopher, in spontaneously awarding a site for a Statue of Dr. Priestley, the Father of Pneumatic Chemistry." Having read the resolution, he said—I consider it a high honour to have been asked to move this resolution—an undeserved honour indeed; for though feeling a warm interest in the object of this meeting, I have not taken a part in any of the preliminary proceedings. The University of Oxford has long stood pre-eminent among the literary institutions of the country, for classical scholarship; its superiority in this respect is recognized as fully by those who are prevented by religious scruples from availing themselves of its advantages, as by those who are educated within its walls. You, Sir, in conjunction with the gentleman who sits on your right hand,* and I will add my old and valued friend, Professor Phillips, are raising it in science to the same eminence which it has occupied in philology. And by the act which we celebrate to-day, Oxford is adding to its former honours, what I regard as the crowning glory of all, theological liberality.

When I have looked on the portraits of Dr. Priestley, and thought of the treatment which he had received at the hands of his countrymen, I have been reminded of the lines in which the celebrated Dutch scholar, Peter Burman the younger, apostrophized his native country, as he stood before a portrait of Hugo Grotius:

> — Anne ideo tantum peperisti patria civem,
> Ut fieres nato dira noverca tuo?

Did his country bring forth such an illustrious citizen, only to treat him with harshness and injustice? With very different feelings I have contemplated the interesting statue which has been placed in your beautiful Museum. It is a recognition of the rank in science which Priestley is entitled to hold, but which has long been withheld from him by theological prejudice. In the consolatory verses which Mrs. Barbauld addressed to him in December, 1792, she says,

> — Well thou canst afford
> To give large credit for that debt of fame
> Thy country owes thee.

The debt has indeed long been over-due. Happily, in regard to such debts, there is no statute of limitations, and we may say that this day it is paid with compound interest.

Dr. W. O. PRIESTLEY said that he had much pleasure in seconding the resolution proposed by Mr. Kenrick, and did so in his double capacity as a relative of Dr. Priestley and as a member of the Committee for erecting his statue. He had hoped that some of the nearer relatives of Priestley would have been present on the occasion. Those assembled were probably aware that granddaughters of that celebrated man were resident in England, and he felt a considerable amount of disappointment that they were not present to witness the cordial tribute paid to his memory. He might, however, in the name of the family, be permitted to say, that it afforded them the greatest gratification to find Dr. Priestley's merits as a scientific man and philosopher at length so fully and so publicly acknowledged; and it must be admitted by all as a most remarkable indication of the advance of liberality in our days, that a statue should be placed in the Museum of the University of Oxford in honour of one who, little more than fifty years ago, would more probably have been burnt in effigy, or indeed might have run some chance of being

* The Rev. Robert Walker, Professor of Natural Philosophy and General Secretary of the British Association.

burnt in person, had he presented himself to the University authorities in those days of intolerance.—The scientific labours and discoveries of Priestley were now universally acknowledged to have been of the highest importance, and previous speakers had done ample justice to his scientific merits; but he (Dr. P.) might be allowed to add that he was not less remarkable for his personal amiability and benevolence; and he had no doubt that after a candid review of Priestley's life and works it would be admitted that he was much in advance of his time in his political and religious liberality.—In reference to the excellent work of art placed in the Museum, it would be a gratification for Mr. Stephens and the Committee to know that Mrs. Joseph Parkes, a granddaughter of Dr. Priestley, who retained for him the tenderest affection, and who had an accurate recollection of his appearance during life, had stated the day before, that she was forcibly reminded in the statue of his face and figure; and the only criticism she might be inclined to make was, that he had been clothed by a somewhat more fashionable tailor than usual during his lifetime.

The resolution was unanimously adopted, and Rev. Robert Walker (Professor of Experimental Philosophy, one of the Subdelegacy of the Museum, and General Secretary of the British Association) rose, amid the applause of the company, to acknowledge the vote. As his presence was required elsewhere in the fulfilment of important duties, he would content himself with explaining that when the scheme of the new University Museum was drawn up, and it was resolved to solicit the statues of eminent men, Her Majesty the Queen requested that she might be furnished with a list of the names of those for whom statues were proposed. In obedience to that command, the list of persons most distinguished in science which had been made public was drawn up. In that list the name of Priestley naturally found a place. No difficulty whatever was made to the proposal. He was entitled to his place of honour among the great founders and improvers of natural knowledge.

Mr. James Heywood, on rising to propose the thanks of the company to the Sculptor, said that he believed Mr. Stephens had worked almost night and day to complete the work in time for the meeting of the British Association. The statue was, he believed, as admirable as a likeness as it was as a work of art. He was pleased to think that relatives of his own had been intimate personal friends of Dr. Priestley. He had often heard his mother, a daughter of Dr. Perceval, say that Dr. Priestley was a man equally remarkable for kindness of heart and elegance of mind. The liberality which the University of Oxford had shewn in this matter was very gratifying. That liberality began to dawn here some time ago. He remembered, when the British Association met at Birmingham, conversing with the late Sir R. Harry Inglis (a man who well represented the University in its better and in its worse qualities), who proposed to him to go and visit the remains of the library of Dr. Priestley which were preserved on the shelves of the Philosophical Society. He went to see those books as the remains of a distinguished and injured man of science. He rejoiced that the statue, for which he desired to thank Mr. Stephens, had a place in so grand and beautiful a building. He trusted that the Museum would promote, as it would greatly facilitate, the study of natural science at Oxford.

Dr. W. C. Henry, in seconding the resolution, alluded admiringly to the discriminative tribute to the merits of Priestley which had been read to them from the Chair. He would not attempt to add a word on that subject; but he might remind the founders of the British Association that at their first meeting, held many years ago at York, his late father (Dr. Henry) had read a paper in which he bore testimony to Dr. Priestley's character as a philosopher, and to the extent and value of his scientific discoveries.

Mr. Stephens, in acknowledging the vote, said that it gratified him not a little to know that the statue which he had created was thought worthy of the place where it now stood, and of the great philosopher in whose honour it was erected.

The Chairman, in rising to dissolve the meeting—the time for which could not be longer delayed—said that he had always considered that amongst the numerous advantages and benefits of science, the greatest of all was the aspiring direction thereby given to the human mind, and he was disposed to set this advantage above even the direct results of scientific inquiry. It is in some respects a humiliating consideration that men should regard it as a thing of merit, that they are not unwilling to pay the tribute of great honour to a man like Priestley. The improved state of feeling in this country was doubtless due in some measure to the greater attention paid to science and the better appreciation of the value of philosophical investigations. The recognition of the great and varied merits of Priestley could not be longer delayed. It is impossible for any man who catches the genuine spirit of science to be

intolerant. We have to do with the exact and minute observation of facts, and with just reasoning on the basis of them. Knowing the difficulties which meet us when dealing with material subjects, we can the better form an idea of the difficulty of attaining to unmixed truth when dealing with subtler speculations. The spirit of science is a spirit of religious and political tolerance.—The Chairman then acknowledged the vote of thanks to himself which had been previously proposed and carried, and in dissolving the meeting asked those present to accompany him to the Museum to take a view together of the statue, the inauguration of which was the occasion of their assembling that day.

Our readers will, we doubt not, appreciate the importance and significance of this meeting. A few days after it, the 69th anniversary of the riots of Birmingham occurred. How great the change! Then, clergy, magistrates, and even the sovereign, looked on without disgust at the wrongs and insults offered to one of the wisest and best of his race. Now, the University which embodies the best learning and the highest social status of the country, and of which the Heir-apparent is a member, delights to do honour to the philosopher and the patriot driven during his life an exile from his ungrateful country. And the event of placing his statue in a new and beautiful Temple dedicated to Science, is inaugurated by men who are themselves honoured members of the British Association. When all the circumstances are borne in mind, the meeting which we have now reported may be regarded as a national expiation of a wrong done to one of the excellent of the earth.

SOUTHERN UNITARIAN SOCIETY.

The above Society held its fifty-ninth annual meeting at the Presbyterian chapel, Newbury, Berkshire, on Wednesday, July 11. The Rev. Henry Hawkes introduced the service, and the Rev. William James preached an admirable sermon on the duty of seeking for and earnestly adhering to Christian truth. At the business meeting of the Society, the Rev. Richard Shelley presided, and the Rev. Edmund Kell read the report. After alluding to the ordinary operations of the Society during the year and its future prospects, the report stated that the Society had petitioned the House of Commons against the obnoxious religious profession clause in the Census Bill. It also recommended an address to our Unitarian brethren in America on the subject of Slavery. The report concluded—"Brethren, would that we could report that we had effected more good during the course of the past year! If we had half that noble zeal which raised the early followers of the Saviour—fishermen of Galilee, unlettered peasants, though they were—to such exalted grade as sons of God and heirs of heaven, we should have done far, far more good than we have even aimed to effect. Do we not believe that we are labourers in the great field of human philanthropy, that we are acting under the direct teaching of Jehovah and of Jesus? But where is the impulse, the effort, commensurate to the importance of our charge? When shall we give ourselves to our heavenly mission as though we were toiling for an eternal world? When shall we feel that our noontide strength and our worldly gains should be given with more unstinted devotion in our crucified Saviour's cause? Our time, our wealth—what are they? We can carry neither beyond the confines of the tomb. But our Father's approving smile for the right use of these talents committed to us shall bring us Heaven's bliss through eternal ages."

The reception of the report was moved by Rev. H. E. Howse, seconded by Sir John Bowring.

J. T. Hart, Esq., moved and Rev. E. Kell seconded a cordial vote of thanks to Rev. William James for his admirable discourse.

Rev. H. Hawkes moved and Mr. Ilaley seconded—"That deeply deploring the existence of Slavery, and the enormous and accumulating evils therewith connected, this Society, desiring to express their opinions upon the subject to the Unitarian Christian churches throughout the United States, authorize a Committee, consisting of Rev. E. Kell, Rev. R. Shelley, Rev. H. Hawkes, B. W. Carter, Esq., and Dr. Watson, to draw up a suitable address for the purpose and to sign it in their behalf, and send it to the Secretary of the American Unitarian Association."

Mr. Edwell moved and Mr. Heathall seconded a vote of thanks to the Secretary and Committee.

A large party of the members and friends of the Society dined together at the White Hart hotel, Sir John Bowring in the chair. We regret our space will not allow us to give an abstract of the eloquent addresses delivered by the Chairman in proposing the sentiments of the Queen, Civil and Religious Liberty, and Prosperity to the Southern Unitarian Society,—addresses which will long be remembered by those who had the gratification of listening to them.—Rev. E. Kell proposed, Prosperity to the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, and their best thanks to J. T.

Hart, Esq., who was present as a deputation from that Society; to which that gentleman responded, explaining the nature and objects of the Association.—Rev. W. James, on his health being drunk as preacher of the day, proposed, "The Members of the House of Commons who signed the Memorial to Lord Palmerston against the obnoxious and inquisitorial clause in the Census Bill."—The Chairman proposed the health of the minister of the congregation, which was responded to by Rev. R. Shelley.—Mr. White, of Southampton, proposed "the Press," and Rev. H. Hawkes the health of the Chairman, which was enthusiastically received.

The meeting having adjourned for a short time, met at five o'clock in the Town Hall, where about one hundred persons sat down to tea, Sir John Bowring again presiding. After a most interesting opening address, the following sentiments were proposed with appropriate remarks:

"The prospects and duties of Unitarian Christians at the present juncture"—by Rev. W. James.

"The Missionary spirit! May its influence be felt throughout the Unitarian church, and soon extend itself to those fields of labour which are now opening in foreign lands especially to Unitarian Christians!"—proposed by Rev. E. Kell.

"The true principles of Christian Freedom! May their influence soon be diffused throughout all nations!"—by Rev. Henry Hawkes.

"Unity of spirit amidst diversity of religious opinion"—spoken to by Rev. R. Shelley.

"Thanks to the friends who have made arrangements for the meeting"—responded to by Mr. Ilsley.

"Welcome to our friends from a distance"—replied to by Mr. Simpson, of Southampton.

Rev. R. Kell proposed, "Our cordial and respectful thanks to the Chairman, whose eminent services on the occasion had contributed so much to the gratification of the meeting," which was acknowledged by Sir John Bowring.—A hymn was then sung by the assembly, and the proceedings of this interesting day were brought to a close by a prayer from Rev. W. James.

E. K.

NORTH-MIDLAND UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

The anniversary meeting of this Association was held in Sheffield on Tuesday, July 3rd. The anniversary service in the Upper chapel was introduced by the Rev. Francis Bishop, of Chesterfield, and the sermon was preached by the Rev. A. W. Worthington, B.A., of Mansfield. In a clear and vigorous discourse the preacher explained the position of liberal Christians in regard to the rule of faith, and after giving a brief outline of the views in which Unitarians are agreed, he sought to shew their intimate connection with virtue, piety and charity, and earnestly enforced the duty of missionary efforts.

At the close of the service, the annual meeting of the Sunday-school branch of the Association was held in the large school-room, which was well filled, a large number of teachers being present from various parts of the district. Rev. F. Bishop was called to the chair; and after the general report had been read by the Secretary, T. E. Paget, Esq., of Leicester, reports from nearly all the schools connected with the Association were read, as well as several reports from the Visitors appointed at the last meeting, of the visits they had paid to various schools during the year. The tone of this meeting was marked by an earnest and practical spirit, giving rise to a pleasant and useful conference.

About 150 ladies and gentlemen afterwards dined together at the Cutlers' Hall, under the presidency of R. Jackson, Esq., Master Cutler. At this meeting the report of the North-Midland Unitarian Village Missionary Society, which was of a satisfactory and encouraging character, was read by the Secretary, the Rev. Rees L. Lloyd, of Belper, and addresses were delivered by the Chairman, Mr. Hobson, Revds. C. Coe, A. W. Worthington, B.A., Francis Bishop, J. Page Hopps, Brooke Herford, Mr. Williamson, of Belper, Dr. Holland, of Sheffield, Rev. J. J. Bishop, B.A., P. W. Clayden, Alderman Fisher, and Revds. T. R. Elliott and W. Birks.

The proceedings of the anniversary were altogether of an interesting and hopeful character, and the local arrangements were such as to reflect credit on the zealous minister and congregation of the place of meeting. It was resolved to hold the next anniversary at Nottingham.

REV. J. C. GANGOOLY AND THE UNITARIAN MISSIONS IN INDIA.

At the present day, all subjects connected with our Indian empire are watched and examined with an interest perhaps hardly equalled since the days of Clive or Hastings. The horrors of the mutiny, the change of the sovereignty, have made Englishmen recognize, as they never recognized before, the solemn responsibilities of our position as rulers of more than a hundred millions of men brought up in circumstances en-

tirely different from our own, under various forms of faith, speaking various languages, and dating back those languages and laws far beyond the time when Christian civilisation began to dawn upon the world. We cannot hope to govern those races upon the same methods as we rule at home over an European people. Without a knowledge, and that no superficial one, of their real wants, and the best methods of meeting those wants, all our endeavours to civilize and improve the native population must fail. Without at all wishing to disparage the valuable and humanizing influence which has been exercised by the missions of the various Societies who maintain agents in India, it cannot be denied that the converts to Christianity are but few and far between; and we cannot hope for any real advancement of the Hindoos till the faith of Hindostan be purified from its varied superstitions and exalted to the simple acceptance of Christ's gospel. Caste, with all its accompaniments, must be destroyed before India can become a progressive nation; and Christianity, as it is presented in general to the Hindoos, has but little power over the mind of the natives, who do not dare to risk the fearful consequences of losing caste for the sake of a faith, the truth of which they cannot recognize, and around which they perceive some of the same objectionable features to which they have been accustomed in their own creed, but which they would rejoice to resign, did something purer and more simple offer itself. While thus at a loss ourselves how to proceed, and hearing with no little interest the accounts which Mr. Hodgson Pratt has brought with him from the East, we have lately had the pleasure of welcoming on our shores a guest who would always have been sure of a hearty reception, but whose presence now seems providential. While the missionary spirit is rising amongst us, and we feel bound to spread abroad those sacred truths which we hold dear, the Rev. J. C. Gangooly has arrived in England, after his two years' residence in the United States, on his way to Calcutta. We trust he will have frequent opportunities of conference with the various Unitarian churches in England, and will be able to turn their missionary zeal into useful channels; and while by his own personal history we take courage, and feel that our past efforts, feeble though they have been, have not been thrown away, we hope that he, strengthened by English sympathy, will go forth to his work among his brethren in the East supported by the knowledge that his labours will be the burden of the prayers of many churches and of many Christian souls throughout this land.

It is possible that the history of this most interesting visitor is not familiar to all our readers, and therefore with the utmost brevity we lay this sketch of him before them.

Jogguth Chundra Gangooly is a native of Bali, a suburb of Calcutta. His family is of the Brahmin caste, of that caste which is dedicated to the service of the innumerable idols of the Hindoo Pantheon,* and the members of which are almost regarded as gods by the lower castes. He is now twenty-four years of age, but has been from his earliest years devoted with the intensest zeal to the study of the literature of his country in which the ancient faith of Brahminism is expounded, to the service of which he had given his whole heart. While thus pursuing his career as a priest, he accidentally met with a Hindoo who had received a packet of tracts from a Christian missionary. Fully persuaded of the truth of his own creed, he took one of these tracts, for the simple purpose of finding out, and then publishing to the world, the errors and flaws which he felt sure it would contain. Fortunately the tract was an extract from the New Testament, containing the greater part of the "Sermon on the Mount." He read and re-read this tract, and to his surprise, instead of discovering anything which he could refute, he found nothing but lessons of such holiness and purity, that his heart was irresistibly drawn towards the Speaker of such divine sentiments. He was impelled to proceed further in his investigation of the faith that thus appealed to everything which was noble in humanity, and after much trouble succeeded in obtaining possession of a copy of the New Testament. To this book he now gave all his time, studying its contents and receiving the lessons which to every unprejudiced mind its sacred pages will impart. When his mind was thus full of Christian thoughts, he called upon a Christian clergyman to obtain from him further instruction on the points which were of interest to him. Instead of receiving satisfaction from this gentleman, the Catechism with its doctrinal teaching was placed before him as a true exposition of Christian principle. The Trinity, the doctrine of Human Depravity and of the vicarious Atonement, were explained to him as the fundamental truths of the Christian religion, and in these he was directed to put his faith if he wished to obtain salvation. Mr. Gangooly has told us a Hindoo story which well expresses the feelings which he experienced when

* The Brahmins recognise no less than thirty-six millions of gods.

these doctrines were first declared to him as Christian truths. "A poor Brahmin, living on the coarsest of coarse food, came from his village to visit a rich friend in Calcutta. On entering the magnificent palace where his friend lived, he was shewn by the servant into a large saloon most gorgeously furnished, and invited to partake of some refreshment. To his utter surprise he found upon the table food of the self-same character that he had in his miserable village home; and being asked why he did not eat, he asked the attendant to wait, and addressed the dish of food before him, 'How is this? Did I not leave thee in my poor unroofed cottage in the village? How is it that thou hast preceded me and arrived here before me?'"

The application is obvious. In his own Brahminical faith he had known a Trinity of the Creator, the Sustainer and the Destroyer; he had known of incarnate gods in the Avatars; the mysteries which the Christian clergyman had required him to believe, they were the very things which had appeared to him repugnant to reason in Brahminism; and in that glorious faith, in Christianity, which in reading the Scriptures had seemed so pure and beautiful, he found again the old absurdities he thought he had left behind.

The catechism and the creeds repelled him, and he lapsed for a time into a pure Theism. Knowing no form of Christianity but that presented in the creeds, he felt himself isolated and separate from every one. He heard, indeed, of Unitarians in England and the United States, and heard of them also as being not Christian, and for communication with them he longed. It was in this state of mind that he became acquainted with our excellent and indefatigable missionary, the Rev. Mr. Dall. From him he received much help. The mist thrown round Christianity by so-called orthodoxy was dispelled, and the pure faith of Unitarian Christianity came like rest to the wounded spirit which had sought peace everywhere, but found it not. Mr. Gangooly became an earnest Unitarian, and, having received such rich blessings himself, determined to devote himself to the great work of preaching the religion he had himself adopted to his countrymen. It was not a light task to be undertaken. He would by baptism lose his caste. He would be a stranger among his kindred and his friends. Even his mother's house would no longer be open for him, and his brethren would not hold intercourse with him. But Christ was his comforter and God gave him courage. He left Calcutta and went to the United States to prepare himself for his great work. There for two years he worked at the various branches of knowledge, to attain which he was the first Brahmin who had ever set foot on American shores. From place to place, too, he went, to tell of the darkness of his native land, and to excite in Christian minds the desire and resolve to help the needy and the benighted heathen. On the 10th of June, 1860, Mr. Gangooly was ordained as a Christian missionary to India in the church of the Rev. E. H. Hale, of Boston. The service, from all the accounts which we have received, must have been very impressive, but especially was the address of the new missionary full of interest. He told his hearers of his conversion, of his repulse by the clergymen, of his gradual conviction of the truth of Unitarianism, and of the plans by which he hoped to bring his brethren among the Brahmins into the fold of Christ. His schemes seem to the writer of these lines full of true wisdom. Like St. Paul, he would not reject the wisdom of the old writers among his countrymen; but to them he would appeal as confirming the great truths taught by Christ, and would point out how the Great Teacher fulfils those wishes which the purest thoughts of Brahmin teachers had suggested. Acknowledging the good already existing in his ancient faith, he would from it lead up to the holier truth of the gospel, and in the very accordance of these two lines of faith would find the highest confirmation for the divine origin of Christianity, which, though first preached to Jews nineteen centuries ago, applies equally well to Brahmins of the present day. We have not time to enter now into further detail of Mr. Gangooly's scheme, but would hurriedly state that he has arrived in England, and preached on Sunday, July 22, at the Renshaw-Street and Hope-Street churches in Liverpool, to congregations which were intensely interested in the services. He pointed out how Unitarianism can alone meet the wants of the Brahmins, and how the man-made creeds repel them; and in the simple manner which is the chief and most charming feature of his preaching, manifested a power and energy which bid us hope great things for his work when, once more amongst his friends, he strives to spread abroad a knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus.

We understand that the collections which are being made in various places after Mr. Gangooly's sermons, are all to be forwarded to London, to the Secretary of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, for the special service of the India Mission, and we trust that the sympathy displayed will prove to Mr. Gangooly how deeply we sy-

preciate the great sacrifices he has made for Christ. Of him it may truly be said that "he has forsaken houses, brethren, sisters, father and mother, wife, children and lands, for Christ's sake." May he also receive an hundred-fold and inherit everlasting life!

MR. GANGOOLY'S ORDINATION AT BOSTON, JUNE 10, 1860.

We take from a recent number of the *Boston Transcript* and of the *Christian Register* a report of the religious service by which Mr. Gangooly before leaving Boston was set apart to the office of a Christian missionary to India. It took place at the church of Rev. E. H. Hale, which was filled by a deeply interested audience.

Rev. Dr. Ellis delivered the sermon. It commenced by referring to the first appearance of Gangooly in this country, when, almost unfriended and alone, he was presented to the Unitarian Association. He spoke of the "instantaneous intelligence" of Gangooly, and how he had repaid the labours of those endeavouring to instruct him in regard to the denominational peculiarities of the United States, an effort about as perplexing as it would have been to obtain from the artizans employed a knowledge of the working plans by which the Tower of Babel was built, after the dispersion and confusion of tongues had occurred.

Mr. Ellis explained the modifications which had taken place in missionary operations in recent years, and commented with pungency upon some of the platform statements of returned missionaries of the American Board. Mr. Scudder, a missionary to Burmah, once described at a public meeting a "night vision" he had respecting the heathen. He fancied he saw three miles of people, stretching over an area a mile wide, constantly marching up to the brink of the pit, and as the advanced column fell over, their places were supplied by new-comers. Notwithstanding this horrible appeal to the sympathies of the audience, which was commended in a leading orthodox organ, the contributions of the entire denomination in the country that year would not have supported a first-class theatre in any of the principal cities for a twelvemonth. Mr. Ellis referred to the fact that the only converted Brahmins who had possessed sufficient zeal to leave their own country in the pursuit of information had embraced the Unitarian faith. If the American Board could have had such a prize as Gangooly, they would have turned every moment of his two years *visit* here to account, and every word into solid gold for the benefit of the missionary enterprize.

After Mr. Ellis had concluded, Rev. S. H. Winkley delivered an expressive "charge" to the newly-created clergyman, who was then introduced to the audience by Rev. James Freeman Clarke.

We must find room, if possible, for the whole of the very remarkable address of this converted Brahmin.

Rev. Gentlemen and Christian Brethren—Like the apostles of old, you are gathered together here this evening, to bid one God-speed in his journey towards home, and towards the field of his labour. Let me say a few words to you, that if you wholly discredit his personal story, his position, his caste, his birth, and his former relation to that Christianity of which he is now to be a minister, you will clearly see that next to that labourer, to that clergyman, to that servant of Christ who is now at work in India, who, as Ananias said to Paul, said to me, "Receive your sight!" —God has given you, next to him, the privilege of putting your hands upon my head, and bidding me God-speed. It is not a sentimental thing when I say that what Ananias was to Paul, your brother and friend in India was to me. It is not sentimentalism at all. I was born of the priesthood of whose civilization, whose literature, whose philosophy, no human history can date the beginning. I was born to be a priest. My life was passed there, marked and exemplary in some measure, although I don't mean to say it in a spirit of pride. The circumstance which made me to become a Christian was similar to that which made St. Paul a Christian. Although I did not precisely and exactly hold the clothes, or stand by those who killed Stephen, yet, so far as I could, honestly and fairly, I opposed Christianity, and so doing, I believed that I did God service. I need not say, as time would not permit me to do it, anything of the gradual change of my belief and my life; but I will only speak a few words in relation to the circumstances under which I came here, and under which I go out to India, and what are my plans for work when I reach my own home. When I think of my life in India and my life in America, when I think of the first Sabbath when I opened my lips in this church, and this last Sabbath in this country that I open my mouth again, my emotions and feelings know no bounds. I cannot, in a short time, give utterance to those feelings; but I will simply, in a few words, speak of those matters which are nearly connected with my coming from and returning to India.

e from my home to your country,
itive slave from Brahminism, as an
runaway, privately, and without
nds, and not knowing where I was
Trusting in Providence, trusting
as a guiding star, I sought your
not on account of my poverty, or
ntion of staying, but to see and
hristianity in Christian countries,
reby receive strength and help, that
go back to India and diffuse those
ngs among our people which I had
here; and I am not entirely dis-
ed. I have learned a great many
seen a great many things, enjoyed
many things—things which are
Christian, as far as human things
I came here a weak man, and now
rong man. I came here helpless,
w go away full of help. I came
nan of sorrow, full of discourage-
nd now I go a happy being, and full
; although I know that on my ar-
India, as our brother pictured the
he very mother whose tender arms
pported me twenty-one years will
sp me, not on account of her lack
tion, but the monster superstition
nd her hands and driven them
Her heart is as kind as ever. She
eart—a mother's heart—and she is
a woman as any I knew in India.
Hindoo, indeed; but if you watched
ly steps, you would immediately
I have not seen such faith, no, not
l." She is a Christian woman, as
er origin and religion permit her to
o to India, but not to my home. I
y work, to perform my duty, and
the best home a man can find. Duty
ome, full of hope to me; and I go
as the field of my work and use-

my plans are somewhat different,
l be different, from the usual plans
ther missionaries take; and I will
u some reasons why I am going to
omewhat different course from other
aries. You know that in our country
a proverb or saying to this effect,
I was a patient once, a sick man,
doctor." So it is with me. I being
oo myself, and brought up a Hindoo,
g under the superstitions of the
, when now, by the blessing of
have thrown them off, and have
e light of Christianity,—knowing
lls and sufferings, and what the
is, I know what remedy to apply.
use of Christ in India suffers a
deal on account of the mistaken
eas of the Christian missionaries.
ot blame them, for they are good,
, devoted men; but they are pre-
judiced at home, and they carry their prejudices with them in the work there. They go, as our brother Ellis spoke beautifully of their proceedings—they go to the people, and tell them that anything outside of the Bible is a humbug, and that anything by the name of Hindoo is nonsense. That is a great wrong, and I think that feeling is one hindrance to the cause of Christ in India. You read the reports of the missionaries of the American Board, and of other Boards, and you will find that their converts are always from the low castes; and although, as a Christian, I do not undervalue or despise the low castes, yet, owing to the position and customs of India, it is a difficult thing to promote Christianity by converting the low castes. Now I see in your papers that you have nominated Lincoln for President, and are going to elect a man to be the first man in this country who belongs to the low caste, whose early life was very obscure—and I hope he will be President, because he is an anti-slavery man. You see that in India the high castes have all the knowledge about religion; and when these missionaries convert a low caste, who knew nothing, who knew nothing even of their own religion, they cannot open their mouth before the high castes. In India, if you convert one of the high castes, you convert ten of the low caste, because, as our saying is, "If you pour water upon the head, you wet the whole body."

I know from personal experience that the Hindoo Scriptures have a great deal of truth. Now what reason have I to say that this Scripture is a humbug, which contains the same doctrines that are taught in the New Testament? The trouble and the pity is, I am sorry to say, that the Hindoos, having these very sublime truths, wrap them up in coverings; they have hid these precious truths under a bushel. Now I am going to take these wrappers and coverings off, and take away the bushel, so that every one may see the light and live.

But I do not say that the Hebrew Scriptures will be all that is needed. No; I go to India to preach "Christ, and him crucified." But I believe, as the apostle Paul says, that "all scripture is given by inspiration of God." Now you can imagine the looks of the original structure by examining the little bricks or tiles that are taken out. You go to Egypt, and you will find some pieces of stone, beautifully carved and ornamented, that seem to have been part of some large building; and by examining these, you can imagine how magnificent this structure must have been. Now if you go to India, and examine the common sayings of the people, you will be

surprised to see what a splendid religion the Hindoo religion must be. Even the most ignorant women have proverbs that are full of the purest religion. Now I am not going to India to injure their feelings by saying, "Your Scripture is all nonsense, is good for nothing; anything outside of the Old and New Testament is a humbug." No; I tell you I will appeal to the Hindoo philosophers and moralists and poets, at the same time bringing to them my light, and reasoning with them in the spirit of Christ. That will be my work.

Now we have sayings to this effect: "He who would be greatest shall be least." You cannot call this a humbug, because it is the saying of our Saviour, "Whosoever would be chief among you, let him be your servant." These missionaries, kind, earnest, devoted as they are, do not know these things, and at once exclude everything bearing the name of Hindoo.

Then, again, I have great faith and hope in my work there, and I will fairly and frankly tell you some of those hopes. Being born a priest, acquainted with the language, prejudices and all the peculiarities of the country, I know that, by the providence of God, I shall be the best medium to effect his work; and I have, so far as I know of your faith—that is, Unitarian Christianity and Universalism—I have come to the conclusion that Unitarianism or Universalism (although I don't find much difference between them) is the only system or form of Christianity that will work wonders in India in converting the Hindoos. Now, one great difficulty with the orthodox missionaries is to hold up the Bible first as a purely, absolutely inspired book. Now, brethren, you have a little charity, and hear what I have to say in this regard. I see in the Old Testament a great many local things which have not a bit of inspiration in them; but it was only human selfishness or interest that prompted them to be written. How can you present them to those people as totally inspired? You cannot preach Christianity if you go with that spirit, that everything is inspired that is inside the Bible, and nothing outside is inspired. I am happy to see that our Unitarian friends have no superstitious reverence for the book, and that they do not repudiate other books. They believe and preach religious truths outside the Bible. One ancient poet says, "Where you find a jewel in the dirt, pick up the jewel, but reject the dirt." So it is when we see beautiful truth; even when it is surrounded with dirt, let us receive and not reject it, because there is a mixture *of Hindooism* in it.

I am not much acquainted with the peculiar doctrines of the church called the New-Jerusalem Church; but from what I do know, I think there must be difficulty in converting Hindoos to their faith. In India, you could not convert a high-caste Brahmin if you told him the whole Bible is infallible. It troubles me to hear clergymen say, "This Bible has a great many local matters, as you say; but our teacher, Emmanuel Swedenborg, teaches us to receive the internal meaning, the spiritual meaning. They have some hidden truth; and we ought to take the internal, hidden truth, and make battle with the hidden infirmities." I believe that is an admirable process; but why not take the internal meaning of the battle of Waterloo or the American Revolution? They are not inspired. But now it is a poor way to say that the whole of God's truth is confined to this book. Judea was a small place, not larger than Massachusetts, perhaps; and if the infinite God, who fills the whole universe, had confined his revelation to that small part, it would be a wonderful thing.

Then, again, the missionaries go with some other things, as our friend Dr. Ellis has beautifully said—with their peculiar theology. Now, you can convert Hindoos to Christianity by shewing a Christian life, as our brother who gave me the charge so beautifully said. That is the best way to preach the Christian religion — to be a Christian. Instead of opening the New Testament all the time before the Hindoo, open your own heart, your feelings, your own lives, and let them read Christianity in them; and that is the best way to preach Christianity.

You have heard our friend say that I was forced to become a Deist. I was, indeed. And what drove me to it, do you think? It was not Christ who drove me to be a Deist. Now, leaving Hindooism, I came directly to Christ, to receive him as my guide to peace and immortality; and it was the missionary who drove me to the church of the Deists; it was not Christ. And what way? You are all aware that it was by preaching a manufactured theology which no human heart can ever master. You who are trained from your infancy under peculiar forms of faith, do not feel it; but I, being a priest, living a Hindoo life for so many years, and groaning under the yoke of superstition so many years—I feel it, and do not feel inclined to put that yoke upon my neck again. I do not feel inclined to put that yoke upon me, but to call upon that Teacher who stood upon the Mount of Olives, and said, "Come unto me, for my

yoke is easy, and my burden light." I do not wish to go back to India to put the yoke of orthodox theology on the necks of my fellow-countrymen.

Then, again, is it possible, in the name of religion, to call a man totally depraved? If I should teach that doctrine, my mother would say, "Joguth, am I totally depraved?" And so it would be with every Hindoo; they would stand surprised that any one could say so. Now, you know that an image of something must contain a similarity to the original. If you draw a picture of that organ, you cannot make it triangular or square; you must make it oblong, like the thing itself. Now, God, who is perfect love, wisdom and holiness, created man in his own image; how, then, could that image be "totally depraved"? It is theology that makes man totally depraved, not God. God is absolutely pure and holy, and man, his child, cannot be absolutely depraved.

Then, there is another thing which is a great mystery to a Hindoo—the idea of hell. I could not live three months, believing that I was going to an eternal hell. That is an absurdity which no man ought to believe. We ought to take care of the little hells before us in our streets and in our parlours. And so in India I do not expect to save so many converts from going to hell, as the orthodox tell us their missionaries do; but I am going to try to drag my brothers and sisters from the little hells, from the grog-shops, and other places —those little, cunning hells; and if you can save men from them, you can save them from the eternal hell, if there is any.

Now, if there is anything called heresy, I freely say that it is the belief that God punishes men eternally. Certainly, I never knew any heresy so bold as this. God, who is a God of love and mercy, a Father, to punish his children eternally, and not for their sins, but because he made them incapable of becoming better! Now, when your children grow wicked, and bring disgrace and shame and ridicule upon your family, you send them to Deer Island, or the Reform School, but not for ever. Your heart's affections and prayers go out after them, and the moment you are told by their teachers, "Your sons are doing well," you go after them in a carriage, if you are able, or on foot, and bring them home. That is the truth that was taught by Christ in the parable of the "Prodigal Son." So, friends, I am glad that the Liberal Christians have no such punishment as being punished eternally, and certainly I am very much glad.

Once more I speak a few words, as this will be the last time. I wish to speak open-mouthed before you. I am going to join my friend and pastor, Rev. Mr. Dall, in Calcutta, and work with him as a fellow-servant in Christ, helping him in any way I can. I was trained in India; I know the language, and I will try to translate your Unitarian literature into our language, and shew the beautiful translations to my countrymen; and this will be a great service. And then, with regard to my reception and living in India. I do not wish to live with Mr. Dall, unless I am forced by poverty or other circumstances to do it. That would injure my missionary influence, because the Hindoos say that the converts become Christians simply to eat beef and drink wine with Christian people. I will falsify that idea by going to live among Hindoos, and shew by my daily life what Christianity can make of a Hindoo. I am going among them, and my place will be to preach the gospel of Jesus Christ. I am going among them as a little leaven which, in God's own time, shall leaven the whole lump. I say I shall not live with Mr. Dall in Calcutta; for if I did, when my friends came there, notwithstanding all their affection for me, they would not come to see me, for they have prejudices against entering the house of a foreigner, and thus I should lose a great advantage.

Now, friends, it is a great advantage to send out a native missionary, letting him go to his countrymen, and preach Christianity in his own way. It is the business of the foreign missionaries to live in Calcutta, among their own people, who can speak their own language. So I go away among the Hindoos, who speak my language, to preach Christ, as a lamb among wolves. But, my friends, the spirit of Christ, the spirit of love, depend upon it, will be my guide.

And in conclusion, I say that my visit in this country has been very much satisfactory indeed. I have spent two years here, which have been the best and happiest of my life, and I go home with cheerfulness to my work; and I have but one word to say—that you who send armies to the battle-field ought to send ammunition and help wherever there is need. You who stay in the camp, do not sit at your table and calculate how much it costs, but give us everything we want. Do not judge by results. Let us do our part, and "He who seeth in secret shall reward us openly." Let us trust the results in India to God, and let us work faithfully, and devote all our time, and energy, and means to the service of God.

ABDOOL MASIH, THE PERSIAN MUSSULMAN CONVERTED TO UNITARIAN CHRISTIANITY.

It is a remarkable circumstance that we may immediately anticipate a second oriental visitor in the person of Abdool Masih.

We take the following particulars of him from a letter from Mr. Dall, of Calcutta, dated March 8, 1860, and printed in the Monthly Journal of the American Unitarian Association.

"The topic of most interest to us just now is the presence with us, for a month, of Capt. Edward Smyth Mercer, and his able catechist, or preacher, Abdool Masih. In our last printed Report (the Eighth), you see something of the doings of this man Abdool, —a Persian Mussulman by birth, and baptized into Christianity ten years ago. From his own lips, I gather that, in May coming, it will be twenty-five years since he was born at the capital city of Teheran, Persia. His parents still live there; and his father is a wealthy merchant of shawls. His attention was first attracted towards Christianity by his meeting in Persia with Dr. Pfander's Persian translation of an English book ('The Very Truth').

"Abdool first went over the Himalaya from Teheran to Herat and Peshawur, which is at the extreme north-western point of British India, at twelve years of age. He at that time accompanied his uncle Amoo, in a caravan of five or six hundred men and five thousand camels, to sell woollen cloths and valuable shawls. He made so good a 'spec' at Herat with the five camel-loads which uncle Amoo had given him to sell, that he got high praise on his return to Teheran. His travels had excited in him a curious and inquiring spirit, even before Hadjah Karapiet, an Armenian Christian gentleman who lived near his father's, gave him to read some Protestant Christian tracts. It was not long before he took another southward journey through the splendid sublimities of the mountains (the north-western spurs of the Himalayas, called on the maps the Indian Caucasus, a little north-west of Cashmere), reading and thinking all along the road. At the town of Herat, set in a magnificent valley, and considered to be the key of India's power in that direction, Abdool resided a year. At this time, his spirit of inquiry was quickened not a little by his mother's brother, who lived not very far away, at Bokhara. Abdool, then only fourteen, was already a merchant, and making money. Ere long, his father wrote to him to come home to Teheran, and be married. In no special hurry to be wedded, Abdool wrote, 'Expect me back, father, in five or six months.' He presently left Herat for Candahar, in Persia; rested there a fortnight; and then went down south, *viâ* Cabool, to Peshawur. There the arms of the gospel embraced him so tightly and lovingly, that he could not get away.

"At Peshawur, forsaking his father's wealth and the offered Persian bride, he was baptized into the Father, Son and Spirit, when about fifteen years old; that is, about ten years ago. The English branch of the Holy Church had put the water on his head, and for four years he remained happy in her bosom.

"But, troubled by the Athanasian Creed and by other things in the Prayer-book, he then felt obliged to step beyond her paling: and so he connected himself with the mission of the American Presbyterians, under the chief pastoral guidance of the Rev. J. H. Morrison: and two and a half years ago, he found a still greater 'simplicity in Christ;' and, as instructed by Capt. Edward S. Mercer, he became a Unitarian Christian. For seven or eight years he has been preaching Christian truth; and for the last two or more, Unitarian Christian truth. He is now spending a few weeks in Calcutta, on his way to England under the eye of Capt. Mercer, who is bound for the old country on 'sick-leave,' and expects to be there between one and two years, taking Abdool, his wife and baby, to his (Capt. Mercer's) mother's at Bath.

"Or, if the Calcutta fund opens wide enough to him, he will give Abdool that English drill which he greatly needs. Capt. Mercer seems a clear-headed and determined, as well as a warm-hearted and devout man; and he has been greatly cheered by what he regards as the success of sending one Asiatic convert to New England, and hopes that, in Old England, another will meet with as generous a welcome. He would give a good deal to secure, to Abdool, Philip Joguth's command of English. Language is the *forte* of the Brahmin, and especially of the Bengalee Brahmin."

AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

The thirty-fifth anniversary of the Association was celebrated in the church in Hollis Street, Boston, on Tuesday, May 29, 1860. Rev. Dr. Hedge, of Brookline, presided on the occasion. After a voluntary on the organ, the congregation united in singing a hymn. Rev. Samuel J. May, of Syracuse, then offered a fervent prayer, in which he alluded to the recent death of

Rev. Theodore Parker, and besought that his surviving brethren might imitate him in his constant search for truth, the consecration of his abilities to its diffusion, and his unwearied labours in behalf of suffering humanity.

Rev. James F. Clarke, the Secretary of the Association, read an abstract of the annual report of the Executive Committee, from which we make a few extracts.

"Our 'Quarterly Journal' has been changed to a 'Monthly.' It is intended to be a strictly denominational work, and it is on that account only that we can ask our parishes to subscribe for it. There seems to be a place for such a periodical—one into which all that concerns the Unitarian body shall be deposited. We do not wish it to contain much literary or miscellaneous matter; not to contain anything, in fact, which could as well be printed elsewhere.

"We have this year adopted, to some extent, a plan, which might be carried yet further, of requesting some of our settled ministers to act as local missionaries in their own region of country. We have, for example, voted a certain sum to Dr. Sheldon at Bath, and to Mr. Fish in Central New York, asking them to supply their pulpits during a certain number of Sundays in the year, and to do missionary work in their own neighbourhoods. Mr. Forman, at Alton, has been doing for us a like kind of work in his region. Mr. Conant at Rockford, Ill., and Mr. Brown at Lawrence, K.T., have been employed to a less extent in the same way. This method seems preferable to that of employing a single missionary, at a large salary, to give all his time to the work. Instead of having one man with a salary of two thousand dollars, we can have twenty men at a hundred. We thus save the time and expense required for travelling from one part of the country to another; for our twenty men are close to the place where the work is to be done. Moreover, they can choose the most suitable time for visiting a place; they can keep up a communication with it afterward; and also we thus have twenty men instead of one to take an interest in our missionary activity. For such reasons as these, this plan seems worthy of further trial.

"Another plan, which we have just commenced, and as yet only partially acted upon, is that of furnishing books and tracts gratuitously to Unitarian circles in those places where there is no Unitarian church. The condition is that they shall meet together, and read the books, sermons, &c., and hold religious services among themselves. Such circles may make the nucleus of a religious society, unite together the Liberal Christians in a community, and be quite as useful, perhaps, as a more regular church. It is, in fact, a primitive Christian church which we propose to establish,—a church of the two or three meeting together in the name of Christ. Ten or twelve men and women can meet together every Sunday; can sing and pray, and hear a good sermon, and converse about some religious subject; can agree to visit together the sick or poor: and so, without calling themselves a church or knowing that they are a church, they become, in reality, a very real and living church.

"Since the 1st of June, 1859, the Secretary has kept the records of the Association, written between four and five hundred letters on the business of the Association, edited the 'Monthly Journal," and preached in its behalf in thirty-eight churches. At nearly all of these places, the Secretary has preached distinctively in behalf of the Association and its mission, and taken up collections in many of them for this object. He has also been at the office almost every day, for an hour or two, to attend to the business which might arise there.

"Professor Huntington, whose position towards the denomination has for some time been indefinite, has during the year left the denomination, and entered the Episcopal Church. On the other hand, we have received into our denomination several ministers who have been previously connected with other sections of the church. These are Mr. Baldwin, of Fon du Lac, formerly a Trinitarian Congregationalist; Mr. Ames, of Bloomington, Ill., formerly a Free-will Baptist; Mr. Town, lately a member of the Theological School at New Haven; Mr. Calthrop, formerly of the Church of England; and Mr. Miller, formerly a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church. One or two more have also joined us, or are about to join us.

"We have also, during the year, aided in the formation of new societies in Bloomington, Ill.; in Fon du Lac, Wis.; in Braintree and Randolph, Mass.; and one or two others. These societies are not always—nor, in the West, usually—called Unitarian: they are composed of Liberal men and women, to whom the word 'Unitarian' is often quite unknown. They contain Unitarians, Universalists, Quakers, and men from all churches: they are variously named the Free Church, the Independent Church, or the Christian Church. But these churches are virtually with us; and it would be a very narrow policy which should require that they should adopt our name before receiving our sympathy and aid. They are most of them hardly organ-

ised, and are in an infant state; but each of them seems a genuine growth, and meets a real want of many earnest men and women.

"The object of the Association is to furnish a centre of unity and activity to the denomination; to offer an instrument for missionary work; to be the agent through which the churches can communicate with each other and with the world. It is the only medium we possess for this co-operation. If we do not unite together and act together through *this* organization, we shall not unite together or act together in any way. Now, individualism is a good thing; but co-operation is a good thing also. Freedom is essential to Christian life and progress; but union is no less essential.

"The problem which all churches are trying to solve is, how to have freedom, and not lose union; how to have union, and not lose freedom. Most churches fail in one direction: we fail in the opposite. They sacrifice freedom for the sake of union: we sacrifice union for the sake of freedom. They, therefore, accomplish more in moulding great masses: we do more for the development of individuals. But the rule, 'This ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone,' is always applicable. One-sided and unbalanced activities never produce a fulness of life: they leave meagreness, thinness and leanness in soul and body. The rule should be, to supply by effort where the tendency is wanting. Our tendency fails on the side of co-operation; and it is there that our effort should be directed.

"Now co-operation with us cannot be based on unity of doctrine or of form. In doctrine we must be always free, and never can be otherwise. We can unite in no creed as our bond of union: all attempts to do this must prove wholly futile. Nor can we unite in any form, whether it be liturgy, ceremony, ritual or hymn-book. In these respects, each church must develop its own life freely in its own way.

"But if our union is not to be found in doctrine or ceremony, it can only be found in action. We can co-operate in work, and in work alone; and as the Unitarian Association is the only medium of work which we have, we must either co-operate through this or not at all."

OBITUARY.

June 8, in the 23rd year of her age, SARAH JANE, the beloved wife of Henry PAYTON, of Birmingham; and on July 13, their child, HENRY TWIST PAYTON, aged six weeks. She had been for several years a consistent teacher in the Sunday-school, and was a valued member of the Unitarian church, Newhall Hill.

June 12, aged 78, at Newport, Isle of Wight, JOHN REAVER MORRIS. His career, which was that of a prosperous tradesman, did not present any striking incident, but his honour as a merchant, his virtues in private life, and his humble and unaffected piety as a Christian, won the respect of all who knew him. He was a firm friend of civil and religious liberty, and a sincere member of the Unitarian church at Newport. After his retirement from business in London, and especially during his residence in the Isle of Wight, reading was his chief occupation and amusement. He loved biography, and had an almost inexhaustible fund of anecdote. He lived much in his own world of meditation, yet he was friendly, social and habitually cheerful. He bore his last illness with the greatest patience and resignation. As he approached the spirit-land he felt more and more the need of Divine aid. He prayed for fuller communion with our Heavenly Father, in whose goodness and mercy he rejoiced and trusted, and spoke of the holy Saviour, "whom having not seen he loved," as having "gone before to prepare a place" for him. Hence death came to him not as a fell destroyer, but a good angel. He had wisely set his house in order, and worldly anxieties did not trouble him in his last moments.

July 10, at his residence, 27, St. Mary's Road, Canonbury Square, in his 79th year, WILLIAM STEVENS, Esq., thirty-five years a member of the Court of Common Council for, and twenty-three years Deputy of, the ward of Bishopsgate Within.

THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CLXXXIX.] SEPTEMBER, 1860. [VOL. XVI.

COQUEREL ON PREACHING.*

No one is better qualified to give practical hints on preaching than M. Coquerel, whose ministry of forty years has been (from the first we believe) a continued and ever rising success, his success being at every step the result of devoted application. Preaching is more decidedly an *art* in France than in England; and M. Coquerel has studied and practised it as an art, earnestly, deliberately, perseveringly, and the more artistically because it is a *sacred* art. He rightly feels that his experience enables him to contribute to the success of younger fellow-labourers in the ministry; and not only so, but to promote among the laity that true appreciation of a minister's work which, in the genuine spirit of Protestantism, may be offered and accepted as his best help.

The present work, we learn, is of more limited scope than the author had originally and long contemplated. He had conceived the idea of a "History of Eloquence as regarded from the Christian point of view." It was to have begun with the ancient models and masters of the art; and after ascertaining how far their rules and examples are applicable to modern Christian preaching, would have traced the latter through its varied history before and since the Reformation, with especial reference of course to the French pulpit. For this larger work he had made considerable preparation, and does not relinquish it without regret at a time of life when he must forego "les longs projets et les vastes pensées;" but he thinks he may still "do a useful service to our churches by putting to paper the recollections and experience of a preacher's career of more than forty years."

If this book is in certain respects less directly calculated to do service to our English churches, its use is still very great to both ministers and people among us, inasmuch as the Christian ministry has essentially the same purposes in both countries; and those parts of the book which most strongly reflect the nationality of the French Protestant Church in distinction from the English, are in turn especially interesting and valuable to us in that point of view. They may even afford some useful hints for the im-

* Observations Pratiques sur la Predication. Par Athanase Coquerel, un des Pasteurs de l'Eglise Reformée à Paris. Pp. 327. 12mo. 1860.

provement of the English pulpit, where the difference is merely that of national habit and not of intrinsic national character.

We shall confine ourselves to a brief analysis of the contents of this book,—the old and too much neglected mode of *review*, which will tell our readers what they may find in detail if they take up M. Coquerel's work, or may more generally prove to be its substitute in their hands, unless it should be translated into English. This, however, is scarcely probable, judging from the very limited encouragement hitherto given to translations of other books by the same author and his family, less characteristically French in their contents than the present volume.

The preliminary chapter sets up a truly high standard of pulpit eloquence, and proportionately expresses the laboriousness of the preacher's office, being well calculated to rectify the common lay idea implied in the frequent "pénible encouragement," *A sermon costs you so little!*

The second chapter is on the danger of imitation. "There are no such things as models of the art of speaking; he who seeks for them and makes choice from among them is utterly mistaken, since the best originals will furnish the sorriest copies; all imitation must border upon aping; the first condition for the orator to fulfil is *to be himself;* and if he is but mediocre or poor, his consolation, I ought to say his resource, will be, to be himself at all events. Native individuality may, up to a certain point, supply the place of talent." One of those lively personal reminiscences follows, which are frequent (but not too frequent indeed) in this book, giving weight as well as animation to its contents. It has reference to the author's early career. Preaching before "un sévère aréopage de vieux experts dans l'art," he somewhat boldly ventured upon "a real prose poem, rounded with description and apostrophe, and recited with unfailing memory and an impetuosity of tone and gesticulation quite absurd, but quite natural and free." The audience were surprised, a little stunned (abasourdi), and on due reflection pronounced stern judgment: it was like a strolling player's preaching (une prédication d'histrion); nothing was to be hoped from it, and preaching was the last thing in the world that he should attempt. The young preacher was somewhat alarmed by so harsh a verdict; but one of his friends, not much above his own age, whispered him, "Never mind; go on still; you have shewn yourself as you really are, and that is the essential thing." He adds, "This expression was a sort of revelation to me; it has unceasingly resounded in my ear, and from that time I could never understand how any course of instruction in eloquence could commence with any but this precept, *Soyez ce que vous êtes.*" It is the source of genuine excellence in every department.

Instead of the imitation of models, the young preacher needs good *hints and criticisms* to correct his own style. "No preacher

knows how he himself preaches; some one must tell him. If sins of ignorance are rare in morals, they are very common in eloquence; a man cannot charge them upon himself; and when he tries to correct them, he does not know whether he has really succeeded." "Neither propriety and elegance of gesture, nor the appropriate use of the voice, are things to be taught, but things to be gained by correction." Every one has his own characteristics from nature and habit; and these have to be regulated and corrected, but they are not to be communicated by any oratorical art. The method adopted by the venerable Jean Monod in our author's student days (p. 24), and now employed at Geneva under Prof. Munier, receives his warm approval. It agrees with the method introduced into our York College by Mr. Bartlett many years ago, and no doubt continued in that institution in Manchester and London since. The young men read or recite, and the teacher points out what is incorrect or awkward. He does not attempt to *make* the elocutionist, but to *chasten* him. But when M. Coquerel suggests to the young pastor to choose a friend or two from among his auditors as censors of his pulpit services, and invite their criticisms from time to time as to his improvement or relapse in matter and delivery, we feel that, in England at least, censors competent to so delicate a task are seldom to be found; and the very suggestion represents the preacher's office to us in a more prominently artistic light than we are disposed to welcome. Nor could our ministers, we think, easily gain the habit of setting their auditors to talk about the sermon, questioning the more attentive, observing the impressions they have received, and studying the success obtained, in order to know how far they have carried the spiritual education of their hearers (p. 134).

In distinguishing the different *kinds of eloquence* (ch. iv.), our author refers to his five years' acquaintance with the debates of the Legislative Assembly, and states that of all the great parliamentary orators of that time, there were only two whose eloquence he could imagine capable of adapting itself with propriety to the pulpit. So special does he consider the characteristics of pulpit eloquence to be.

Discussing next the *best kinds of sermons*, he finds all kinds good, for variety's sake, "except tiresome ones," and excepting most decidedly allegorical and typical sermons. The exegetical, he thinks, are too much neglected among Protestant preachers. On the "choice of a text," he insists that the text *be* a text to the discourse, and not "an excrescence (comme une superfétation) still demanded by usage, but of which there is really no need." "To choose a text is to place one's instructions under the sanction of an authority which it would be a contradiction to evict after having invoked it." And he insists that the preacher must keep to the real and natural meaning of the text, corrected when

necessary by sound criticism. He does not seem to us very happy in all his instances of texts taken in their apparent but not real sense. On the following, at least, it is by no means admitted that the obvious meaning is a mistaken one: "By detaching from their context the words of Job, *If a man die, shall he live again?* (xiv. 14), it seems as if the problem of immortality was proposed in them in a manner favourable to the purposes of eloquence. But the sense is, If a man die without being cleared of the calumnies which have pursued him, without having won back his good name, will he revive to claim it? and this has no reference whatever to the future life." Certainly he who interprets the above passage with M. Coquerel ought to preach accordingly, and we admire the fine morality which says, "This faithfulness of the preacher to the real sense of the text is more than a mere precept of oratory; it is clear that we have no right to make the Bible deliberately say anything but what it does say; one may be excused for a mistake, but not for a deliberate one" (p. 82). To some instructive instances of the good and evil choice of a text, he candidly adds a mistake of his own. After being chosen pastor by the French Church at Amsterdam in 1818, and at Bordeaux in 1823, he was recalled to Amsterdam in 1825, and took for the text of his initiatory sermon, 2 Cor. xiii. 1, *This is the third time I am coming to you.* "The number three had seduced me (he says), and in fact the reckoning was right; but I had much ado to put into the discourse all that suited the occasion. I still hear the murmur of the audience caused by my reading this singular text, and our mutual edification suffered from it" (p. 91).

An admirable chapter follows on *witty and ingenious sermons* (de l'esprit dans les sermons). The French are fond of putting *de l'esprit* into everything, and have sometimes carried it into the pulpit; yet, to their credit it is to be said, less often than the more northern nations of Europe. Our author lays it down as a principle that "an amusing sermon must always be a bad sermon."

He next warns the young preacher against rocks and shoals (de quelques écueils de la prédication). Personality is denounced; anecdotes are almost absolutely proscribed; as are also all quotations from other than sacred books, excepting the works of the chief reformers, and short maxims, &c., from other writers. Poetical quotations are considered even more out of taste than prose ones. Long comparisons, elaborate descriptions, and "lyric and bucolic sermons" (by which he explains himself to mean such compositions as seem to echo of *Young's Night Thoughts* and *Harvey's Tombs*), are sternly refused admission into the pulpit of Protestant eloquence.

The next subjects treated of are, pulpit boldness (hardiesse), allusion to passing events (actualité), the education of the audi-

ence by preaching, and the question of age. In this last the difference is pointed out between the Catholic and the Protestant minister, with the former of whom, be he young or old, the *opus operatum* is everything, while with the latter the *personnel* is ever changing and ought to be growing in power for good. To the young preacher he beautifully says, "The surest way of obtaining the result which St. Paul recommended to Timothy, saying, *Let no man despise thy youth*, is, always to remember yourself that you are young." Such happy turns of thought and expression as this characterize the book throughout.

At the fifteenth chapter we come to the *composition of sermons*. Plan and method are essential, but without formality and uniformity of division. These are unnatural. The division may arise either out of the subject or out of the text. The want of method is stated to be the commonest fault of preachers, betraying want of industry on their part, and causing the loss of all tangible impression on the part of the hearers. *Gradation* is a part of method, and our author has excellent hints on *exordium* and *peroration* especially. He mentions a sermon of his own, the opening of which was so striking that its publication was requested, though the friends who asked for it remembered nothing beyond that exordium. From this incident he learnt two rules: "to resist the temptation of an *abrupt* exordium, and to attach great importance to the peroration."

The *three modes of preaching* are next discussed in order: the written sermon read from the pulpit, the same recited *memoriter*, and the extempore method. The reading plan, as pursued chiefly in England, receives no mercy at his hands. It is "le froid système de lecture." He cannot conceive of eloquence in reading. A manuscript is a sheet of ice interposed between the orator and his audience. He is witty upon the English bishop or clergyman with his large velvet cushion, larger even than his manuscript, with no other gesture than that of turning over his pages, and at rare intervals what is called *the waving of the hand*, "that is, the exertion of raising the hand, to let it drop again instantly on the edge of the pulpit." He is a little one-sided, however, in saying that the Dissenters meanwhile have been aiming at true oratory; and not very well informed (for he could hardly judge so ill, we think) in placing Spurgeon with Irving as the model of emulation among the most popular of the established clergy (p. 259). He has some amusing anecdotes, given with evident gusto, of preachers from notes turning over two leaves at once, or devising means for mitigating the nuisance of having to turn over the leaves at all, when a different action would better suit the oratory, &c.; and admitting, as he is forced to do, that some readers have been among the most eloquent of preachers, he only says they have triumphed over an obstacle which has overthrown many of their compeers, and "if they read so well, how would it have

been if they had preached without book?" Probably they would have altogether failed, is our reply.

Memoriter preaching is, he says (speaking of the French Protestant preachers), by far the most common method; and it is that which he recommends to all young ministers "for a noviciate of several years" at any rate, as the only safe mode of ultimately attaining the extemporaneous method, which he regards as the true preaching wherever attainable. He would have them always write the discourse in full with extreme care, and even make a fair copy of it. He gives this special French reason for the most minute care in composition and for exactness of verbal committal to memory: that "the French is the most prudish of languages, forgiving no mistake and permitting no compromise." The young orator is recommended to recite his discourse aloud in his study; and when the hour comes, he is to take his manuscript with him into the pulpit to be ready in case of failure of memory, but to keep it quite out of sight unless such an unfortunate exigence should occur. "A Christian audience will more easily bear with a young man's failure of memory, than pardon his idleness if he reads, or his presumption if he extemporizes."

For a considerable part of his early ministry M. Coquerel himself preached *memoriter*, and had no expectation of attaining the extempore faculty. But two occasions put him to the proof —the unexpected demand for a charity sermon at Leyden, where he had arrived on a Saturday night; and a benefit society's meeting at Paris at which he felt impelled to refute on the spot a Saint-Simonian intrusion. In this way he thinks the memoriter preacher will, on some occasion or other, find his extempore faculty, if he has it. Probably so; but we may be permitted to doubt whether the former habit really cultivates or leads to the latter faculty. And we feel disposed to give much more force than he will allow to the objection made against rote preaching, of producing "constraint, affectation, undue emphasis, stiffness of gesture and excess of intonation; whereas extempore speech leads to a more natural, warm and *sympathetic* delivery." To this objection he replies, that "many instances protest against the justice of these alternatives. If memory is sure of her matter, the elocution will not incur the alleged faults; and even the delivery of an extempore discourse may be as much out of keeping as the discourse itself." Our own observation leads us to maintain the contrary. It seems to us perfectly easy for a judicious ear to distinguish a memoriter sermon or speech from an extempore one, by the ever-recurring disproportion, in defect or in excess, between the matter and the delivery, if not even by false intonations and evident *parroting*. An extempore speech, if *désordonné* in matter, will be proportionally and appropriately so in delivery, because it will be *sympathique* throughout, the irregularity and disjointedness of manner sympathizing with the

same qualities in the matter. Many a genuine piece of rough oratory recurs to mind.

The *memoriter* mode of preaching, which seems to be the rule in France, is, we believe, the exception in England and America. Usually, among us it is either extempore or by reading. The former method is chiefly adopted by the *Evangelical* church and the Orthodox Dissenters, the latter chiefly by the *High and Broad* church and by the Unitarians. The few exceptions in every class confirm the rule. Certainly there is but little extempore preaching in this country that would come up to M. Coquerel's idea. The best of what passes for such is, we believe, usually memoriter, this method prevailing among the Independent and Baptist Dissenters of the more educated order, where, however, the visible manuscript would too directly defy the cherished illusion that the preacher speaks "as the spirit gives him utterance." But some few of the most advanced of these men venture even to read their discourses from the book.

We have no hesitation in expressing the conviction that *good* extempore preaching is the highest style of all; and that, with ordinary popular audiences, the extempore method, even in a less perfect style, may be more effective than written addresses of a much higher order. But if the question be asked in reference to English Unitarian congregations, a very different answer must be given. No extempore preaching but the very best would do there; and the majority of our ministers find their best written discourses more acceptable and useful than their best *extempore* efforts could be. Taking men of their average attainments, and congregations of the average social and mental rank that ours bear, we believe that, as a general rule, our ministers will combine the greatest amount of excellence and command the best usefulness as preachers, by writing their discourses and reading them as they ought to be read. We also maintain that more men are capable of good reading than of good improvisation. Our Unitarian congregations insist upon a fulness of sound matter, a clearness of order, correctness of composition and propriety of illustration, at any rate, that are seldom found in strictly extempore sermons. And if the choice is to lie between a good sermon well read and the same sermon recited from memory, they would look upon the latter as a poor device well dispensed with, and think their minister's time better employed in other studies than in the mechanical labour of putting his manuscript into his memory. Once throw away the transparent delusion of speaking by immediate divine suggestion, and this seems to follow. Or let the ignorant auditor who insists upon retaining it sit *under* the pulpit, or anywhere out of sight of the preacher's note-book, when the preacher whom we are speaking of reads his sermon *in the way in which he would have spoken it the moment he wrote it*, and our auditor will accept a sermon so

delivered as the true extemporaneous speech on which he so strongly insists.

On this subject of extempore preaching *(improvisation)*, it is curious to compare our author with Mr. Henry Ware, whose "Hints" on the same subject are well known in England, and are twice referred to approvingly by M. Coquerel. Each regards this as the most effective mode of pulpit address, and gives many admirable rules for its attainment. Each also strongly deprecates the idea of adopting it as an easy-going, idle way of preaching, or a *pis-aller* for want of time. But it is observable that Mr. Ware recommends it earnestly to those who desire progress in theological knowledge on the express ground "that it redeems time for study," and he thinks an hour enough for the preparation of a sermon.*

M. Coquerel, on the other hand, repeatedly disclaims the idea of saving time by his method. Indeed, it is plain that writing in full and committing to memory must demand an increased expenditure of time; and this, we must remember, is his *regime* for all preachers till by its means they come to *improvise*. Improvisation proper he defines indeed essentially as Mr. Ware does: "The speaker knows what he is going to say, but not how he shall say it" (p. 193). But he seems to represent the composition of sermons, whether by writing or meditation, as an incessant work. The preacher is to have a sermon always on the stocks *(toujours un sermon sur le métier)*. He repudiates as a deceptive antithesis that precept of the Abbé Gros de Besplas, which we are disposed to cherish as the true rule for good sermons as soon as a man can afford to act upon it: "Do not summon your thoughts because you want to compose a sermon; but compose a sermon because you have thoughts ready: God alone can create from nothing." Extempore preaching is, as M. Coquerel well says, both the easiest thing to do and the most difficult; easy (to some people at least) if talking is all, difficult indeed if such speech be meant as he has described.

Mr. Ware, it is observable, never recommends *memoriter* preaching, either for itself or as a preparation for the extempore method. It does not occur to him to regard the one as a step to the other. But M. Coquerel traces their analogy thus:

"For extempore preaching it is, if possible, still more necessary than for memoriter preaching, that the composition of the discourse be complete in all its parts. To write a sermon on paper in order to learn it by heart, and to write it, as I may say, in one's head to speak off-hand, are essentially the same operation of mind, varying only in form; their difference being, that the one entrusts to the pen both the ideas and the

* "A very large proportion of the topics on which a minister should preach, have been subjects of his attention a thousand times. He is thoroughly familiar with them; and an hour to arrange his ideas and collect illustrations is abundantly sufficient."

words, the other entrusts the ideas to memory and leaves their developement for improvisation. If these considerations are just, it is inexcusable rashness to improvise without having composed; it is immeasurable folly to imagine that an *extempore* sermon is to be an *impromptu* one." P. 217.

It seems to us that the so-called "difference in form" is the essential difference in the art. Composition,—in the sense of material, arrangement, argument, illustration, application,—is required in all cases; the developement by language at the time is the one great difference to the preacher. We see not how the habit of reciting from memory can aid the acquisition of this power, unless so far as the change is less *conspicuous* than that of dispensing with the accustomed manuscript. At all events, Mr. Ware addresses his suggestions directly to the acquisition of the power of extempore utterance, without regarding the memoriter method as intermediate or auxiliary. His object was, in fact, to help young Americans and Englishmen to extemporize instead of reading; whereas M. Coquerel's is to help young Frenchmen to extemporize instead of committing to memory. And the latter is yet more careful than the former to leave no room for slovenly *impromptu*. His chapter of hints on improvisation (ch. xxi.) is truly excellent.

We must hasten to the end of our remarks. "The continuous work of the preacher" is so described as to forbid the possibility of his sinking into routine. Revelation and Christianity are inexhaustible; the minister's vocation imposes upon him the necessity of progress: if he removes to a new sphere of duty, the calls upon him vary, and he must adapt himself to them; or if he fulfils his whole ministry in one place, new wants grow up there, a new generation comes, and he must walk on with it. Another chapter compares *the moral and artistic aspects of preaching*. Another, "on the *importance of the sermon in public worship*," may seem, to English ideas, if not to exaggerate its absolute value, yet to disparage in comparison the devotional services and reading and exposition of the Scriptures; but at any rate it rightly describes the relative time and labour required to be bestowed in a minister's preparation for his pulpit; and in this respect every one confesses the *primauté du sermon*. An encouraging chapter on the *good done by preaching*, and one on the *responsibility of the pulpit*, conclude this delightful volume. We have already given so many short extracts as to illustrate sufficiently its style and contents; but a longer one tempts us as historically descriptive of the last half century of Protestantism in France, and bearing obvious comparison with the experience of liberal Christianity in England. He is speaking of the work of a minister as continuous and progressive when he says,

"My own ministry has realized this experience. I might in vain have desired to follow old tracks. I had to apply the verse,

'Times are changed no less than place.'

"There was no difficulty in understanding that it would be useless to preach at Paris as I had done at Amsterdam, and that a different religious sphere required a different exposition and defence of religion. The course of time and progress of ideas also brought a corresponding lesson. While, for twenty years and more, an exclusive system prevailed, and its leaders replied to our proposals of peace, *There is an abyss between you and us* (an abyss so far from deep that at present we cross it daily), I thought it my duty to expose and combat such disastrous tendencies; I thought that the advocacy of peace and Christian truth was inseparable from the defence of liberty. I think so still, and do not at all repent of having, not begun indeed, but sustained my part in, that distressing but necessary struggle. Of those efforts, in which the most eminent of my colleagues pledged their future, as I did mine, we are reaping the fruits. We owe it to that resistance which cost us so much, that we see religious liberty at the present day better understood and better welcomed in most of our churches; harmony reviving, and theological studies pursued without retrogradation. But though I feel no regret for having sustained this controversy, I should have great scruples in being the first to revive it at present. Why? Because men's minds are following another direction. The opponents of conciliation, who have read nothing for a quarter of a century, find themselves in a desert in proportion as they hang back; the last defenders of intolerance within the Protestant Church are more and more forsaken; and sectarian epithets are growing out of use. Preaching was bound to assume a different shade and a new range. I have, like many others, joyfully made a holocaust of old discourses, as my offering on the altar of peace; and I am much mistaken if many of my dear brethren, in conjunction with whom I maintained the good cause, have not come to believe with me that this victory is sufficiently well assured to allow of our aiming at further progress."—P. 243.

MEMORIALS OF DR. PRIESTLEY. BY JAMES YATES, M.A., F.R.S.

1. I COMMENCE these Memorials of Priestley with a notice of the house in which he was born, Field-head, in the parish of Birstal, near Leeds. It was the family house, and was occupied by Dr. Priestley's father and grandfather, and afterwards by his sister, Mrs. Crouch. On the death of her husband in 1786, it appears to have been abandoned by the family as a residence, and, being covered with ivy and much dilapidated, it was lately taken down. It was two stories high, built of stone, and in the ordinary style of the farm-houses and other moderate dwellings in that district. I visited it in the early part of the present century. Its appearance is shewn in a photograph by an amateur artist at Leeds.

PORTRAITS AND ENGRAVINGS FROM THEM.

2. The earliest portrait of Dr. Priestley, photographs from which will be ere long delivered to the subscribers to his statue

at Oxford, is now the property of Mrs. Bilbrough. I first knew this picture, and heard Mrs. Crouch speak of it as the portrait of "her brother Doctor," more than fifty years ago. Mrs. Bilbrough, in a letter from Gildersome, says, "My impression is, that Mrs. Crouch brought her brother's picture along with the old family clock from her father's, Field-head, when she came to live here in 1787." Mr. Crouch having died in 1786, and the family house being abandoned, as above mentioned, his widow went to live with my mother's first cousin, Mr. Hudson, who was a bachelor, and resided in his paternal abode at Gildersome. Here I used to visit him, and saw the picture. It has always hung there in the dining-room with other family portraits. It has been highly valued by its possessors, who have been unwilling to part with it on any terms.

Mr. Hudson used to relate the following story. The picture was once placed in the window of a carver and gilder's shop at Leeds, when the Doctor stopped to look at it in passing by. A woman happened to be doing the same, and, on seeing him, exclaimed, "Why, here's the fellow himself!"

This portrait is carefully painted and well finished. It may be presumed to be a good likeness. The features are the same as in the later portraits, allowance being made for advance in age. It has also the same pleasant expression. The full-bottomed wig is a remarkable distinction. I believe this was the costume of the divinity students, when they left the Academy at Daventry to settle in the ministry. When Dr. Priestley assumed the wig with curls, in which he appears in all the later portraits, I have not been able to ascertain.

Mrs. Bilbrough's maiden name was Ellen Priestley. Her father was Mr. Hudson's first cousin. When the Committee of subscribers to the statue resolved to have the photograph from this portrait executed by Caldesi and Co., I directed that the inscription under it should be "Joseph Priestley, æt. 30, from a portrait formerly in the possession of William Hudson, Esq., of Gildersome." The age was inferred from the features, and Mr. Hudson's name added from my own distinct recollection of the former position of the picture in his house.*

3. Portrait belonging to Robert A. Wainewright, Esq., of 24, Compton Terrace, Islington, who married Sarah, daughter of Joseph, eldest son of Dr. Priestley. In this we see the wig with curls, the same in fashion which the Doctor always afterwards wore till he went to America. Painted by I. Millar in 1776 or 1777, i.e. during his connection with the Earl of Shelburne. Mr. Wainewright, in a letter to me, dated Feb. 22, 1860, says, "Dr. Priestley's eldest son, my wife's father, told my wife it was the best likeness of Dr. Priestley he knew, and was a very faith-

* A few copies of this photograph are on sale at Whitfield's, 178, Strand.

ful resemblance." An excellent portrait of Mrs. Priestley, a pendant to this, also belongs to Mr. Wainewright.

4. Portrait now in the possession of Thomas Thornely, Esq., of Liverpool, and formerly of his father. Painted by Peter Holland, formerly of Birmingham, whom I remember as the drawing-master at Mr. Shepherd's school at Gateacre, near Liverpool. Similar in style and character to the last, but not so well executed.

5. Portrait formerly in the possession of Mrs. Judith Mansell, of Birmingham, who was the intimate friend of Dr. Priestley. She bought this portrait in Birmingham soon after the riots of 1791. It had been part of the plunder carried off from Fair Hill, which was his residence. During my residence in Birmingham, I used to see it hanging over the fire-place of the dining-room of Mrs. Mansell's house in Temple Row. The artist was not known, nor was it much valued by the person from whom she bought it. But she and her four sisters, having deliberated upon its proper destination, decided that it would be best to bequeath it to Manchester New College. Since the removal of this institution to London, it has hung in the Library of University Hall, Gordon Square.

6. Portrait by Fuseli, painted for Joseph Johnson, the bookseller, in 1783. At this time Priestley was Joseph Johnson's guest in St. Paul's Churchyard, and was requested to sit for his portrait, that it might remain in the house which he was accustomed to frequent, and in which he enjoyed the society of such men as Fuseli, Opie, Price, Geddes, Wakefield, Aikin and Bonnycastle.* After Johnson's death, the portrait passed into the hands of Mr. John Miles, a relation, at West End, Hampstead. He allowed it to remain in a state of neglect at the top of his house, until, in 1828, Mr. Rowland Hunter, who was Johnson's nephew and successor, persuaded him to give it to Dr. Williams's Trustees. It belongs to them, and is preserved in the Library, 49, Redcross Street.

In this portrait the Doctor is represented in a sitting posture, and partly in profile, nearly all the others being front views. The head is rather thrown back; and a Mr. Cox, still living in Birmingham at the age of 90, who remembers Priestley, says, that he always walked with a quick step, and with his head thrown back, as if looking at the heavens.

Mr. R. Hunter, who often saw Priestley at his uncle's, being then about twenty years old, says this is an excellent likeness. The late Mr. Joseph Priestley thought it "a then marked and strong likeness of his father, but in features rather exaggerated."†

Fuseli's biographer says, "He had a happy method of giving

* See Britton's Autobiography, p. 283.

† Private letter from Joseph Parkes, Esq., February, 1860.

from memory likenesses of those persons whose physiognomic cast of countenance took his fancy; but the only portraits which he painted regularly from life, were those of Dr. Priestley and Mrs. Neunham, a niece of Mr. Johnson's. The portrait of Dr. Priestley is very characteristic, and Fuseli always felt convinced that he should have succeeded as a portrait-painter beyond the expectations of his contemporaries, if he had turned his attention to that branch of the art."*

As this is the only portrait of Priestley which contains his whole figure, it has been of great use to the sculptor, Mr. Stephens, in forming his statue.

7. In the year 1835, the Rev. George Kenrick, one of Dr. Williams's Trustees, published a letter, descriptive of this portrait, in the Christian Reformer; and in consequence of his subsequent exertions, aided by Richard Taylor, the learned printer, an excellent engraving from it by C. Turner was published in the following year. Only 100 copies were printed.

8. Portrait by Opie, painted at Joseph Johnson's. It belonged to the Rev. Mr. Hole, a Devonshire clergyman, who had been Wakefield's pupil. It subsequently came into the possession of Mr. Barham, of Exeter, and was by him bequeathed to Manchester New College.† It is now preserved with No. 5 in University Hall. Of the mutual regard which subsisted between Dr. Priestley and Mr. Barham, a record is preserved in a letter of the former written in 1791.‡

9. When Dr. Thornton published his splendid work, "Illustrations of the Sexual System of Linnæus" (London, 1801), in which he relates the discoveries of Priestley and Lavoisier in pneumatic chemistry, he employed his engraver, Caldwall, to make a copy from Opie's portrait; and he has placed Priestley above Lavoisier in the same folio plate, as if to indicate Priestley's superiority.

Opie's portrait has little of the mildness and cheerfulness which are conspicuous in all the others except Fuseli's; but it exhibits much more vigour and determination of character, and conveys more the idea of a man of talent and genius. It has been principally followed by Mr. Stephens in the countenance of his statue.

10. Portrait, or miniature, by J. Hazlitt. I only know this from the engraving of it, a copy of which is in the Print-room of the British Museum, and has written under it, "J. Hazlitt, pinxt.," "W. Nutter, sculp.;" also "The Rev. Joseph Priestley, LL.D., F.R.S., &c.; published April 14, 1789, by J. Hazlitt, No. 65, Margaret Street, and sold by R. Cribb, No. 288, High Holborn." So far as I can find, this small neat oval is the earliest engraving of Priestley.

* Knowles's Life and Writings of Henry Fuseli, London, 1831, Vol. I. p. 407.

† Private letter from Rev. J. Kenrick, February, 1860.

‡ Rutt's edition of Priestley's Works, Vol. II. p. 112.

11. Portrait by W. Artaud. This artist was a member of Dr. Abraham Rees's congregation in the Old Jewry, and afterwards in Jewin Street. He was much employed by the Dissenters, and his portraits were highly valued. That of Price is well known as a pendant to this of Priestley, in consequence of the engravings of both having been published at the same time and in the same style and size.

This admirable portrait was presented to Dr. Williams's Trustees in 1804, soon after Dr. Priestley's death, and is preserved with No. 6 in the Library, Redcross Street. It was finished just before the Doctor left England. (See Memoirs, Rutt's edition, II. 291, note.)

12. Under the engraving by T. Holloway we read, that it was published "July 15, 1795, and sold by T. Holloway, Newington Green," &c.

13. Drawing in crayons, a profile, looking towards the left hand, executed in America. In this the Doctor appears without his wig, which he ceased to wear when he left England.

14. An engraving from this drawing was published by David Eaton, 187, High Holborn. It is also prefixed to Dr. Priestley's *Notes on Scripture*, in 4 vols. 8vo.

15. Portrait by Gilbert Stewart. This artist was an Englishman of the highest promise. But early in his career, being a drunkard, he left England, and settled in Boston and Philadelphia. His works are rare, and bring high prices, the portrait of Washington giving him a world-wide celebrity. His portrait of Priestley was painted for the Philosophical Society at Philadelphia, of which he had long been a member. The Society had paid Stewart for it. He nevertheless sold it to Mr. Barclay, of Wavertree, near Liverpool, who had gone to America on business, and happened to see the portrait in Stewart's studio. Mr. Barclay had been a hearer of Dr. Priestley at Hackney, and, when he saw the picture, expressed his wish to purchase it. A price being named, he paid it down, and took the picture away. The Society claimed it; but after a correspondence, Mr. Barclay retained his prize, and is still the owner.

Mr. Joseph Parkes, to whom I am indebted for these particulars, and who married Mr. Joseph Priestley's eldest daughter, further says of this most beautiful and interesting portrait,— "My father-in-law, Dr. Priestley's eldest son, always told me, that the above portrait was the best likeness of the Doctor in his advanced old age, especially doing justice to his natural sweetness and placidity of temper, that it was impossible a better likeness could be taken, and especially that this portrait marked the simplicity of expression and manner."

16. About the year 1812, Artaud made two excellent copies of this picture, one of which now belongs to Mr. Joseph Parkes, and the other (17) to his brother-in-law, Mr. Joseph Priestley,

of Northumberland, in Pennsylvania. A small copy (18) was also made for Mr. Charles Knight, the bookseller, which now belongs to Mr. Joseph Parkes.

19. During my residence in Birmingham I called one day on Mr. John Badams, a manufacturing chemist and a clever amateur artist, and saw one of these pictures, together with a very good copy which he had made from it.

It remains that I should mention the two engravings from this portrait.

20. Mr. John Partridge, now portrait-painter to the Queen, made one, which was prefixed by the Rev. R. Aspland to the valuable Memoir of Priestley in the Monthly Repository for 1815. The preceding volume contains an announcement of this "Frontispiece," stating that Stewart's picture was painted in 1803, "was the last for which the Doctor sat," "and was deemed by his son, Mr. Joseph Priestley, and those friends who best knew him, to be the most characteristic and interesting resemblance that exists." Mr. Partridge's engraving was also sold separately.

21. The second engraving is by W. Holl, much superior to the first, and also sold separately. It was made from the "small copy" of Stewart's picture, above mentioned, and for insertion in the Gallery of Portraits, which was published by C. Knight under the superintendence of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge. Lord Brougham has introduced this fine engraving to embellish his account of Priestley in his Lives of Eminent Men of Letters and Science, Lond. 1845, Vol. I. p. 402. The placid and amiable looks of the great philosopher, which were the real index of his mind, supply not a weak answer to the severe and disparaging remarks of the noble biographer, although these remarks were at the time still more fully answered by Mr. William Turner, Jun., in the Christian Reformer.

Medallions in Terra Cotta by Wedgwood, and Engravings from them.

These medallions in three different sizes shew Priestley's profile, looking towards the right, in white upon a blue ground. They are supposed to be after designs by Flaxman. During the period of Priestley's residence in Cheshire and Lancashire, he was on terms of intimate friendship with Wedgwood and with his partner, Mr. Bentley, of Liverpool. Wedgwood, who, besides his zeal for chemistry as applied to manufactures, was a steady and liberal Dissenter of the same class, befriended Priestley in every possible way, and appears to have bestowed the utmost care on these beautiful medallions.

22. The largest of the three is partly ideal. Instead of a wig, it represents Priestley with natural hair, curled and bushy at the lower part, so as to be something like a wig. The countenance, however, was no doubt taken from the life.

23. The next in size is much more delicately and beautifully wrought. The head, including the bust, is 14·2 centimetres (5⅝ inches) high. In this the Doctor wears his wig with curls, as he appears in all the subsequent portraits. He wears a plain cravat, a shirt without any frill, and a kind of fancy robe instead of a coat with buttons.

This medallion and the last appear to be the earliest likenesses after the oil painting, No. 2. About the year 1765, Wedgwood gave a copy of this (No. 23) to Miss Aikin, then of Warrington, afterwards Mrs. Barbauld, and another to Miss Nicholson, of Liverpool, who, being Miss Aikin's schoolfellow and companion, often visited her at Warrington and knew Dr. Priestley intimately. She considered this medallion as a most excellent likeness. Miss Nicholson married Mr. Boardman, of Liverpool, who was connected in business with Wedgwood and Bentley. She left the medallion to her son James (still living), who carried on the business, and he gave it in 1859 to Mr. Henry Taylor, of London. Mr. James Boardman gave another copy to Thomas Thornely, Esq., of Liverpool, late M.P. for Wolverhampton. I have seen a fourth in the possession of the Rev. R. Brook Aspland, of Hackney, and a fifth belonged to the late Joseph Priestley, Esq., who gave it to his youngest daughter, Mrs. Robert Wainewright.

24. The third of Wedgwood's medallions is much less than the other two. A copy of it was shewn to me by Josiah Parkes, C.E., brother of the above-mentioned Joseph Parkes, who was called Josiah after Wedgwood. His father, Mr. John Parkes, of Warwick, was the intimate friend of Priestley.

25. Mr. Henry Taylor obtained photographs, a little reduced in size, from his copy of Wedgwood's second or middle-sized medallion. He presented copies to me and to other friends.

26. Engraving by Angus, an oval, reduced from the same. Published in C. Forster's "Literary Magazine," No. 41, Poultry, Feb. 1, 1792. Two copies of this engraving may be seen in the highly valuable illustrated copy of Walter Wilson's Dissenting Congregations of the Metropolis, which is preserved in Williams's Library, II. 228, and III. 353.

27. Engraving by Tardieu, seems to be exactly copied from the last, and to have belonged to a French work.

28. Engraving by G. Murray, a profile, looking to the right, and in this agreeing with all the six preceding profiles, but with an ordinary coat instead of the fancy robe.

29. Engraving by W. Bromley, "published by I. Sewell, Cornhill, Jan. 1, 1791," in the European Magazine, with a short account of Priestley. The profile is in a circle, looking towards the left, much reduced in size, and delicately executed. It is from the design of Stothard, who has added under the circle with much elegance two children blowing bubbles of air, and a female

holding a discharger in her right hand, and elevating the chain of a Leyden jar with her left.

30. Profile in an oval, with the name, "Joseph Priestley, LL.D., F.R.S.," above in the oval, and flowers and foliage encircling the frame. Underneath is a collection of electrical apparatus, viz., an electrical machine having a glass cylinder and multiplying-wheel, a conductor, thunder-house, Leyden jar, three books, pair of compasses, pallette with brushes, &c. This is a beautiful and tasteful composition, but there is no name of artist or publisher.

31. Profile prefixed to the Life of Priestley, by John Corry, Birmingham, 1804.

32. Profile, looking towards the right, No. 53 in Darton's "Cabinet of Portraits, 58, Holborn Hill, 1822." The engraving rather coarse, but strongly marked. After a record of the birth and death of Priestley, it is added,—"His publications are numerous, and in his mental constitution were united ardour and vivacity of intellect, with placidity and mildness of temper. In the domestic relations of life he was uniformly kind and affectionate. Not malice itself could ever fix a stain on his private conduct, or impeach his integrity. Such was the man who has added one more imperishable name to the illustrious dead of his country."*

The late Mr. Britton, in his Autobiography (Vol. I. p. 286, note), says, that he made a profile of Priestley reading his farewell discourse at Hackney in March, 1794, and that it is among the portraits in the European Magazine. But it is not there. The writer's memory appears to have failed him in this as in some other things.

Medals.

33. Bronze medal, diameter 3 centimetres (1¼ inch). A well-executed profile, with the face looking towards the right; round the bust, "Joseph Priestley;" under it, in smaller letters, "S. G. Hancock, F." On the reverse, a rectangular pneumatic trough, with glass jars in the water, on a table, with pincers, hammer, &c., an electrical machine, and other apparatus. Under this apparatus the date MDCCLXXXIII.

34, 35. Two medals of large size, one bronze, the other silver, commemorate Priestley's retreat to America. In both the countenance is turned towards the right; features the same as in Halliday's medal, hereafter mentioned, and probably taken from the small bust by Halliday. Under the bust, Phipson, F. Round the bust, Josephus Priestley. On the reverse the following inscription:

* This eulogy is taken almost verbatim from Brewster's Encyc. Edin., V. 757, 758.

APR. VIII.
BRITANNIÆ
LITORA LINQUENS
COLUMBIAM ADVENIT
JUNII IV.
MDCCXCIV.

This is surrounded by a circle, with a marginal inscription, which differs in the two medals. In the bronze it is,

MAGNUS CHRISTIANUS PHILOSOPHUS.

In the silver it is the line of Virgil, Æn. vi. 546,

I DECUS I NOSTRUM MELIORIBUS UTERE FATIS.

36. Profile resembling Halliday's bust, turned towards the left; under it, HALLIDAY; in the surrounding circle, JOSEPH PRIESTLEY, LL.D., F.R.S., followed by the abbreviated titles of the foreign Academies of which he was a member. The reverse bears the inscription which is on the marble tablet erected to his memory in the New Meeting-house, Birmingham. This medal is in bronze and block tin; its diameter, 5 centimetres.

37. Bronze medal differing from the last as follows: under the head, HALLIDAY, F.; the face larger than in the other, the features and drapery different.

Copies of all these medals are in the British Museum.

SCULPTURES.

38. Small bust by Halliday. I have only seen this in plaster. The artist lived in Birmingham, and was a hearer and warm admirer of Dr. Priestley. He is supposed to have produced an excellent likeness. The costume is the same as in Wedgwood's middle-sized medallion. Perhaps this bust was the authority for the engravings above enumerated equally with the medallion. A copy of this bust is in Williams's Library, having been presented by Mr. W. J. Taylor, the medallist, who in part executed the medal, No. 36.

39. Tablet of white marble, erected in the New Meeting-house, Birmingham, to the memory of Priestley by his congregation soon after his death. The artist was Hollins, except that, as Mr. William Hawkes informs me, the excellent profile under the inscription was by Mr. P. Rowe, "at that time a sculptor of much eminence in London." The inscription was written by the Rev. Dr. Parr, whose skill in epitaphs was renowned. It has often been asked, why the town of Birmingham did not raise a monument to Priestley? Probably those who offered this suggestion were unacquainted with the monument in the New Meeting. His countenance is exhibited in the medallion, and the great, admirable, and attractive features of his mind in still finer lines by means of the inscription. This inscription is generally known by being copied on Halliday's medal, No. 36, and pub-

lished in the original edition of the Memoirs of Priestley, Lond. 1807, Vol. II. p. 825, and in Rutt's edition, Vol. II. p. 532.

40. A cast in plaster from the marble medallion at Birmingham is in Williams's Library, and may be obtained from Mr. Peter Hollins, son of the artist.

41. Statue in Caen stone, by E. B. Stephens, of Pimlico. Size of life. Erected in the new Museum at Oxford, as related in the last number of this periodical.

42. Photograph from the statue, by U. E. Wright; a copy to be presented to every subscriber, together with the photograph, see No. 2.

Trinkets and Seals.

43. The trinkets here referred to are about the size of a pocket-watch. I have seen three of them, containing under glass a profile two centimetres high, very delicately moulded in wax, and preserving a good likeness of the philosopher. In these he has bands round his neck, significant of his pastoral office. In all the other works he is without bands, although in the pulpit he always wore them with the gown. Probably these elegant memorials were made for the members of his congregation, especially the young, and may be regarded as tokens of their affection and veneration.

Numerous seals, shewing the head in profile, have been made both in metal and in terra cotta.

Academical Honours.

44. The Copley Gold Medal, given to Priestley by the Royal Society in 1773. See Weld's History of the Royal Society, Vol. II. pp. 51—69. This precious medal is preserved by Robert A. Wainewright, Esq.

45. Diploma from the Imperial Academy of Sciences at St. Petersburg, dated in December, 1780, and constituting Priestley a foreign member under the authority of the Empress Catharine II. This diploma is the property of his granddaughter, Miss Catherine Irene Finch. It is very beautiful as a work of art. On each side of the engraved writing is a spiral column, bearing emblematical representations of the arts and sciences in circular discs. The seal of the Academy, stamped with the Imperial Eagle, is enclosed in a box of silver gilt, and attached by silken cords with tassels.

46. "A handsome silver inkstand," presented to Dr. Priestley immediately before "his departure into exile" by W. Frend, Tweddell, Godfrey Higgins, James Losh, Dr. Edwards, Sykes, Northmore, and other "members of the University of Cambridge." See Memoirs, edited by Rutt, Vol. II. p. 225. This interesting relic is preserved in Australia by Dr. Priestley's granddaughter, Mrs. Bowen.

PHILOSOPHICAL APPARATUS.

47. When Priestley, after his first settlement at Needham, in Suffolk, attempted in vain to obtain the means of livelihood by giving lectures, he purchased *a pair of globes*. (Memoirs, p. 38; Rutt's edition, I. 41.) These globes still exist. The terrestrial globe (without date) bears the following inscription: "A new and correct Globe of the Earth, together with a View of the General and Coasting Trade, Winds, Monsoons, &c., laid down according to the newest Discoveries and from the most exact Observations. By John Senex, F.R.S. Now made and sold (with very considerable Improvements) by B. Martin, in Fleet Street." The celebrated Benjamin Martin was the principal globe-maker of that day.

When in 1758 Priestley went "to London by sea to save expense" on his way to Nantwich, it appears that he took the globes with him. He used them in his school, and, on his removal to Warrington in 1761, sold them to the Rev. John Houghton, who having completed his theological studies at Glasgow under Principal Leechman, and having first settled at Platt, succeeded Priestley at Nantwich both in his chapel and in his school. He was an assiduous teacher of youth, and pursued that employment at Norwich, with the assistance of his son, the Rev. Pendlebury Houghton. Mr. Henry Dowson having married the daughter of the latter, the globes are in their possession.

48. On Priestley's removal to Nantwich, the improvement in his circumstances enabled him to purchase an electrical machine. His elder scholars were taught to use it in making experiments for the instruction and entertainment of friends and neighbours as well as of themselves. Among these elder scholars was Philip Taylor, or (as Priestley calls him in a letter now before me, April 9th, 1762) Phil Taylor, who followed Priestley to Warrington, and was a favourite pupil. The electrical machine came into his possession, and from him it has descended to the Rev. James Martineau, who was for a short time his colleague in Dublin. It is exactly the same kind of machine as that shewn as the "Common Machine" in the plates to Rees's Cyclopædia, Vol. II., Electricity, plate ix. fig. 11. It has been broken and repaired, and, in making the repairs, a winch has been substituted for the original wheel and pulley, so as to turn the cylinder the wrong way.

49. Another of Priestley's electrical machines, constructed with a globe instead of a cylinder, is now in the collection of philosophical instruments, having an historical value, which belongs to the Royal Society. It is the same which is described and figured in the numerous editions of Priestley's History of Electricity, and of his Familiar Introduction to the Study of Electricity; also in Rees, as above, plate viii. fig. 9, and in Brewster's Edinburgh Encyclopædia. This machine came into

the possession of Dr. Robert Cappe, of York, who at his death in 1802 bequeathed it to his friend and fellow-student, Dr. Bostock. I well remember its arrival at my father's house in Liverpool, as Dr. Bostock and I then lived as brothers under his roof. It was recently repaired and presented to the Royal Society by my nephew, Mr. Bostock, who has taken a very warm interest in the erection of the statue of Priestley, and has acted as Secretary to the Committee.

RUINS.

50. Soon after the riots was published in long quarto a volume, which possesses a deep and melancholy interest, entitled "Views of the Ruins of the principal Houses destroyed during the Riots at Birmingham." It contains eight views, with descriptions both in English and French. The views are drawn by P. H. Witton, Jun., engraved by W. Ellis, and published by Joseph Johnson. The first view shews the New Meeting in ruins; the second, Fair Hill, with Dr. Priestley's laboratory; and the remaining six, the houses of some of the principal Dissenters. The text contains a minute and animated account of the conduct of the mob.

FINAL ABODE.

51. Having commenced this catalogue with Dr. Priestley's birth-place, and noticed his handsome abode near Birmingham, where Dr. Aikin, visiting him in 1784, says, "The great philosopher, with his simple, bland, unaffected manners, contented and happy, and declaring that he had not a wish on earth unsatisfied, gave me infinite delight," I now conclude with a notice of his last residence and his grave.

Mrs. Wainewright has a drawing of his house at Northumberland. It has every appearance of neatness, elegance, and comfort. Its owner has described the surrounding scenery as very beautiful and magnificent. It is satisfactory to know that one of the greatest and best of men, after some very severe trials, was surrounded in the decline of life with all that was necessary to external ease and respectability. His eldest son, whom I had the happiness of knowing intimately and now remember with sentiments of the highest regard, was his companion till the moment when he died. A view of this house is given in the engraved title to the Centenary edition of Priestley's Memoirs, Birmingham, Radclyffes and Co., 1833, 12mo.

52. Dr. Priestley was buried at Northumberland in the same tomb with his energetic and excellent wife and his son Henry, to whom he was fondly attached. Can a drawing of their grave be obtained to close this list of memorials?

"The wish Dr. Priestley had expressed, after surviving an affectionate wife and a highly promising son, was accomplished. He shared their burial-place; and, while the sciences he cultivated are advancing to perfection; while the rights of man, which

he ably vindicated, are successfully asserted; and especially while the scriptural views of Christian theology, which he taught with all the ardour of an apostle, are multiplying their adherents among the serious and the considerate, it may be fairly expected that, in other and distant times, the wise and the virtuous will frequently indulge some grateful recollections beside the grave of Priestley."*

In compiling the above catalogue, which the Editor of the Christian Reformer has kindly offered to publish, it has been my object to obtain further information, so as to render it still more complete. I also hope to have the engravings, photographs, manuscripts, and other appropriate documents, bound together, that I may finally present them to the Royal Society, or some other public body, to be preserved for the use of posterity, and in honour of so great a philosopher and so eminent an example of Christian piety and virtue.

BIRTH AND DESTINY OF MAN.

O LISTEN to the heavenly call,
Hear what the Scriptures loudly teach,
The infant innocence of each,
The final bliss of all, for all!

In purity our lives begin;
And while through mists and darkness driven,
All sorrow, suffering, shame and sin,
Are discipline to fit for heaven,—

The evil shall be wrought to good,
The good made better, and the best
Alone shall rule, alone shall rest,
Out of the vast vicissitude.

O work the most sublime and sure,
By infinite perfection schemed—
The babe all passionless and pure,
The man eternally redeemed!

Beginning, ending,—each divine,—
Though shadowy clouds may roll between;
God! Thou wilt lift the mortal screen,
And all shall track that course of Thine,

In which the unfolding of the plan
The heaven-illumined eye shall see,
And frail and perishable man
Merge into immortality. JOHN BOWRING.

* Works, by Rutt, Vol. II. p. 533.

GLIMPSES OF THE HEAVEN THAT LIES ABOUT US.*

Signs of vitality, indications also of promise for the future, are to be found in our own recent religious literature. Not that the amount of literary production yielded by the members of our free churches is greater than in other periods, but that a greater proportion of their productions bears the tokens of our theological tendencies, and a very considerable number are direct contributions to the religious culture of the age. In Mr. Poynting's book now before us we are pleased to welcome a work of great originality, exhibiting a wide range of scientific research, and breathing a fervent religious spirit throughout. The plan of the book may be briefly summed up as follows. The Introduction claims to discover a harmony of science, philosophy and theology, in the purpose of the Divine Mind to educate the spirit of man so as to lead him to become a partaker of the Divine Nature. Part I. is called "Seeing with the Imagination." It is composed in the form of a vision with angelic and sacred interlocutors, and opens with the disembodiment of a spirit by death and his introduction to the supersensual state. In this state the soul is gifted with direct perception of the material universe as illumined by the glory and active presence of God. Observing first the person of a surviving friend, he beholds him transfigured, and with the divinely imparted spirit of life visibly flowing through his frame. From this discovery he is further led on by an angelic teacher to hear the voices by which the eternal Love is ever calling to the soul of man through his religious and moral qualities. Thence he is taught to behold the wonders of the cerebral and nervous systems, and the purport of the lower desires and appetites. From the human frame and the human affections, the reader is carried through the varieties of animal and vegetable forms, then to the vision of the atoms or spirits of which the material creation is compounded, and further on to the waves of light and of sound and to the atomic motion which produces heat. Then begin descriptions of the composition of the earth, water, metals and chemical phenomena. After a short return to the economy of the human frame, the vision proceeds to the wonders of terrestrial magnetism, and thence to those of astronomy. Chapter xix. opens the geological history. This the disembodied spirit is ingeniously enabled to read by travelling at once to those remoter parts of space at which the successive primeval appearances of the earth, traversing space only with the speed of light, have just arrived; and then, by approximating to the earth again, the subsequent series of the history is read from their several points until the seer reaches "the rising of man upon the globe,"

* Glimpses of the Heaven that lies about us. By T. E. Poynting. London—Whitfield. 1860.

"the formation of the masterpiece which should complete and close the drama of creation." Chapters xxvii. to xxxii. form a sort of theological digression; two of them are devoted to the explanation of a mystical three-ness or trinity, consisting of divine and brotherly love and practical holy energy; one chapter to an idea of the incarnation of Christ as the culminating centre of the divine purpose, and another to the doctrine of reconciliation. Lastly, the history of the human race is described in vision somewhat as the angel Michael discourses to Adam in the eleventh and twelfth books of Paradise Lost. The instructions of Christ are enlarged upon, and the post-Christian ages are briefly reviewed. A glimpse of the glories of the earth when the human race shall be sufficiently perfect to see those things which the angels see, closes the First Part of the work before us. Such is a very bald summary of the greater portion of this volume; and as such it is inadequate to convey any idea of the mode in which this vast range of subjects is treated. For this purpose we select an extract from chapter ii. of the First Part. It is a description of what the author calls "the central miracle," or the inpouring of the divine life into the human soul. In his disembodied state, with senses quickened to perceive the secrets of the heaven about us, he beholds the friend whom he has left mourning at his departure:

"He was truly transfigured to my view. The glory of his spirit shone through the outward frame, and clothed it with its beauty, as the sun shines through a fleecy cloud and clothes it with light.

"But the miracle which met my eye was this: *The living flame of the inmost spirit was supported, like all other things, by the fountain-stream of the Divine glory raining down and up and all around, from the everlasting depths.*

"There is a painting of the Resurrection, by Rubens, in which the Christ is represented as rising from the tomb, and streams of radiance are bursting from his form, illuminating all the space around. So from the form of that dear friend did streams of light appear to extend until they were lost to the eye in the immeasurable distance. Only, as I discerned, the streams were ever travelling *to*, not *from* that radiant form. They were the light-beams of Deity passing into the spirit of my friend, to teach it and to bless it. God's yearning so cleaves to the beloved soul, that He will never for a moment leave it. He loves to feed it out of his own secret life. He so delights in the work of blessing it and raising it to himself, that he every moment must be at that work. Ah, surely he has made the mother feeding her babe from her own life-streams, and thus finding it ineffably dearer, an emblem of himself! But still more has he made such an emblem of himself the spiritual mother watching over a beloved child, and seeking to feed his inner being from springs of her own soul, seeking to breathe into him all her own best thoughts, to kindle in him all her purest feelings, to make him the image of her purer self. Thus did I see that the Father was seeking to breathe his own thoughts and feelings, his very life, into his children's spirits, and so make them sharers of his own divine nature,—

one with Him,—growing into His image from glory to glory."—Pp. 16, 17.

The foregoing extract will perhaps be regarded as merely the amplification of a fanciful and pleasing idea: but the facts of science are treated in a similar manner, as the following extract will shew. It describes the vibrations of light as actually visible among the atoms of space.

"Thus the whole space was filled with the multitudinous quiverings —like the flutterings of so many beamy wings—of the countless atoms. *And I saw that each atom was bright, and its boundless wings or fountain-lines were bright in proportion to their quivering.* And I asked the meaning of this. And the angel answered, 'Light is but the form under which God himself conceives of his own activity, and therefore it is the form under which he presents this activity to his children spirits. The sense of *Light is the sense of Divine activity.* Suppose a human being, with human eyes, now to stand beside us. The atoms of that broad ocean before us, struck by the same rays, are quivering over all the surface. As they quiver, their web of wings or fountain-streams must quiver with them; some of these fountain-lines would pass through the eye, and the quivering would be felt by the sensitive curtain,—the retina hanging at the back of its chamber. We may conceive that curtain as *itself trembling in the light-beam,* like the curtain of a window waving to and fro in the fitful breeze. The telegraphic lines from the curtain to the brain carry in lightning flashes the report of this trembling; the conception of light is awakened in the mind, and the atoms of the sea appear bright and coloured, according to their motion. Thus all this conception is awakened by the Divine activity, and what the eye sees in the atoms and calls Light, is the *intensity of Divine action.* We angels are all eye; our ethereal being is sensitive throughout to every quivering, and hence all objects—since all are in intensest motion under the Divine activity—full of the Divine life—appear to us under the form of light more or less intense. While at the same time, since the wings of every atom in the universe pass through us, we have, as it were, telegraphic lines running to ourselves, telling us of all that is happening throughout the boundless space. As thou wilt find, then, we have only to look into ourselves and decipher the telegraphic signals there, in order to read all that is passing in the material universe. It is this very immensity of knowledge, crowding upon the spirit at once, that makes necessary the body to shield it in its infant existence in the great school of God.'"—Pp. 110, 111.

Among so many subjects, all treated more or less in this manner, selection is difficult, though perhaps for our immediate purpose we could not have chosen better. If, however, we separate the scientific element from the seership in so novel a manner mixed up with it, there is much to be said on the felicity with which many natural phenomena are described, and the ingenuity of classification bestowed upon the vegetable and animal kingdoms. In the three chapters called "Ranks of the Cherubim," there are theoretical descriptions of animals from their lowest to their highest forms, and of plants of every kind, which are vivid

and philosophical. The chemical phenomena appear to us less fortunately treated. For geological descriptions the author quotes Hugh Miller. In the more general treatment of the results of science, it will, we think, be found that where the existing knowledge of any particular branch is sufficiently complete for generalization, there the author has received the fullest information from his angelic instructors. The scientific value and interest attaching to this First Part of the volume before us, must, we fear, be limited to the degree in which the subjects are capable of being treated in the author's peculiar method. Indeed, it may be questioned whether the author's method, notwithstanding the charm which the book may have for general readers, and the deep religious element interwoven with the whole of it, can resist the test of criticism; but before proceeding to any further remarks on this head, we will give an outline of the Second Part, and which is entitled, "Verifying by the Reason." We commence by quoting a passage from the opening chapter.

"I inquired anxiously with myself why the faith of modern days seemed so weak, puny, and unreal, compared to the faith of earlier times, and I found it was that God has made it the law of the human mind that it shall not be able to have any belief deep, real, earnest, unless that belief is in *harmony* with the rest of the mind's convictions and feelings; and I saw that in modern times such a flood of new ideas had been poured upon the mind, that the work of harmonizing our faith with knowledge had become gigantic.

"My first discovery which led me on to all the truths which made my faith possible was that of this law of harmony as the foundation of belief. I saw that it was a wonderful fact that the grand belief announced in the Scriptures, 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord,' the belief in the *unity* of God, has been made by the Maker of our minds to lie at the very foundation of all our belief and all our knowledge of this universe. There is an instinctive conviction in the human mind that the Mind—or call it whatever we will, *Nature* or *Law*, that shapes and rules the universe, is *one*—one in thought, aim, purpose, and operation. Man is naturally Unitarian here; whatever theories he may hold about *distinctions* in the Godhead, still, as his reason developes, he instinctively falls back on the belief that God is really one; that all that comes out of the Godhead is one great harmony; and thus therefore between all true things, that is, all things which form a part of God's realities, which stand in God's world, there must be harmony; they must all form portions of one great unity. Practically the only way by which we know anything to be *true* is that we find it *harmonizing* with other things which we accept as true; and were it not for this instinctive belief in unity—resting on the unity of God—we should have no power to know anything in this universe: we should be the deaf amid eternal harmonies. Now it would seem that because harmony is the essential law of all God's being,—because He is the great *Reason* (order, method), has he breathed into man two rays of his own reason; the Intellectual Reason, which we call the Reason; and the Moral Reason, which we call the Conscience. He has made the essen-

tial condition of their nature and action—as it is the condition of his own—the belief in and the craving for harmony. They are like two inward senses; they sit as judges; and affirmations, or theories or suppositions come before them for belief as witnesses come before a judge. Whatever affirmations appear to them to be harmonious—to agree with other truth already believed, they accept as true and worthy of belief. Truth indeed is but another word for harmony. To say that a thing is true, is but to say that it is harmonious with, forms a part of God's great harmony. *Our only test of truth is harmony.*"—Pp. 349—351.

The chapter from which our extract is taken proceeds to explain the Newtonian law of philosophizing, identified with Sir Wm. Hamilton's "law of parcimony," whereby we reason from the known to the unknown, accepting as causes such things as are known and are sufficient to explain phenomena. In chapter ii. it is observed that in the divine purpose of the education of the spirits of men a "vera causa" is to be found.

"*Spirit*—spirit inspired with the design of man's Divine education—is a known cause. It is quite sufficient to account for the phenomena of the universe. I am bound by the law of my mind, bound by consistency to be content, and to say, Spirit possessed with the purpose of educating minds *is* the cause of the phenomena of the universe. To say that we know nothing about that cause because we have no experience of it from the senses, is surely to lie to ourselves. It is to adopt a method of thought which we should scout in other instances. What should we say, for example, to the scepticism which mocked at our Astronomy, and told us we really know nothing about the causes of the motion of the moon and planets; that we know nothing about the heavenly bodies; except that we see them, specks of light, moving variously in the blue concave? at the scepticism that mocked at our Geology, and told us we know nothing whatever of the causes which operated in ancient times to form the rock and the fossil, that we know only how these things now appear, and that is all? What should we say, in fine, to the scepticism that would pass through all our science, all our philosophy, and thus ruthlessly sweep away all the conclusions that go beyond the evidence of the senses? And yet, unless we are thus prepared to resign the larger portion of that upon which we pride ourselves as our *most certain modern knowledge*, and fall back into the very ignorance of barbarism, we may not say without lying to ourselves,—I must use no softer term, positively *lying* to ourselves,—'We know nothing about any invisible Spiritual Cause of the Universe, and of its phenomena.'"—Pp. 362, 363.

One of the objects of this chapter is to demonstrate that our ideas of a "law of nature" and our "mechanical conception of the universe" are "spectres of the mind," interfering with our direct knowledge of God, "*the eternal fountain of life and power, a cause quite sufficient to account for the phenomena.*"

Gravitation and Repulsion, and the idea of atoms acted upon by the laws which those terms express, are taken up in the third chapter, and declared to be "*idols of the tribe and of the theatre.*" After explaining the law of gravitation, Mr. Poynting inquires

what is the force which acts by that law; it has, he says, no limit.

"The force which at this moment holds my hand down upon the table whilst I write these words stretches through all the unbounded space. This is an awful conclusion, and yet it is inevitable. If this force faded somewhere away, then it would decrease in intensity at a greater ratio than the square of the distance; but it does not, as far as we have been able to trace it, and therefore we conclude that to decrease according to the square of the distance is its law throughout Infinity; that is, that it is perfectly infinite and everywhere the same in amount. What was Newton's discovery as regards the laws of the moon's dependence on the earth, but simply that the law of the diminution of this intensity of gravity according to the square of the distance, and the *square of the distance only*, extended to the moon? In all that distance, 240,000 miles from the earth, it had diminished only exactly in that proportion. It diminishes in that proportion throughout the whole extent of the solar system. It keeps this law while we can follow it: how natural to infer that it keeps it in the far regions where we cannot follow it.

"The Force, and the law by which it acts, are then known. And now we put to ourselves the question, This force, what is it? Is it some unconscious agent, some plastic nature, some Hylozoe—material soul or life, as Cudworth terms it—which the Creator has set to do his work? We *know* nothing of any such ethereal yet brute unconscious agent. We have no experience of any such existence. In supposing such a thing apart from God, we are supposing—inventing—a new cause of our own imagining, utterly unlike anything that we have experienced. We do know of God and his existence. Here is a 'Vera Causa,' a known cause. It is a cause, too, quite sufficient to account for the Phenomena. It is quite sufficient to account for the lines of force, to suppose that the all-present, all-pervading Will of God acts in these lines, that gravitation is in fact the will of God acting with Physical force (like our will acting with muscular force) towards chosen centres."—Pp. 375, 376.

The fourth chapter treats of the "Eidola" of the sciences of chemistry and electricity, suggesting that we need not suppose substances to differ in kind, while "*it is only necessary to suppose, what we know to be fact, that they have different amounts of force.*" Similarly does our author refute the notions of electric and magnetic fluids. Chapter v. examines the "idols, light and heat," considered as substances; and chapter vi. the principles of animal and vegetable life. The seventh chapter, called "Man the Archetype," maintains the proposition that the final purpose for which the Creator works is to impart the divine life to man, and in this our author proposes to discover a "vera causa" to explain the whole intention of creation.

"Man's being is constituted just as it ought to be if it is intended to enable him to know God and share His life; and man's history has been just what we might expect, if God is educating him from the nothingness of animalism to angel heights."—P. 421.

"Nature is constituted just as we might expect it to be constituted if it be intended to be a series of living pictures to reveal to man that ever-present God, whom to know is to have the divine Life—is Life eternal."—P. 422.

The closing chapter asserts the harmony of the Scriptures with the educational design of the universe.

"The whole Scripture is the unfolding of the Divine Education. There is in it a beautiful historical succession of developments. It is the gradual approach from the depths of night towards the perfect day. At first, in the patriarchs, we have the faint beams of the dawn, then in the prophets the light still deepens, until at last the sun of righteousness himself arises with healing in his wings."—P. 431.

We have now given our readers an outline of the contents of a book which may be described as an attempt to build up a natural theology on a new basis; and to discover in the phenomena of the universe the visible presence and operations of the Almighty, his beneficent designs, and the purposes of his love towards the human race. The aim of natural theology is to identify the first cause of the physical universe with the Object of religious thought and worship; and this has hitherto been attempted by the argument from design and the observation of the moral purposes apparent in many parts of the creation. In the instance now under review, it is attempted, in the First Part of the work, to recognize the personal presence and operations of God in the forces visible in the material universe, by viewing the phenomena thereof through the medium of the religious emotions; and, in the Second Part, to substitute the idea of God in the place of the laws which have hitherto been regarded as secondary causes or modes of operation. The method of Mr. Poynting's First Part is styled by him, as we have already stated, "Seeing with the Imagination." The Second Part lays down the grounds of reason upon which the imagination seeks to build.

In order of production, the author informs us that the Second Part was written first; and it is obvious that this must have been the case. Were our knowledge of phenomena commensurate with our theories, and were we able to discover by intuition instead of by induction, the order which the author has adopted would be just, and the verifications of the reason would follow the perceptions of the higher and more perfect faculty. But, alas for our human limitations!—if, indeed, it be right to deplore the mental conditions imposed by Almighty Wisdom—the direct perception of the eternal designs is not permitted to us: and though we may indulge the imagination with glimpses through the veil of mystery which hangs between our senses and the essential qualities of things, we may not claim for our glimpses the authority of sight: rather must we exercise our reason in that spirit of reliance which will impart to it the nature of a faith by which we may walk. The author, indeed, seems to

have been conscious of this difficulty when he put into the mouth of an angel the teachings of the First Part of his book,—admitting, as it were, that his views of the universe from the sphere of the imagination belong to another condition of being; while in the Second Part his argument rests on the, for us, surer authority of such names as those of Newton, Humboldt or Faraday. We assign, then, to the Second Part the higher value, as a contribution to both science and theology; and moreover we consider it as intrinsically valuable in a very high degree. It is the substantive part of the book, well thought out and well written. The first book is fertile in illustration, and in many parts eloquent as well as ingenious. But we think there is a defect in the method, and that a clue to this defect may be found in the author's employment of the imagination as a faculty for the immediate discovery of scientific truth. There is a broad distinction between the objects of imagination and those which we actually perceive or infer, as there is a radical difference between the function of the imagination and that of the reason. We think Mr. Poynting has somewhat confused these distinctions. The Divina Commedia is an imaginative presentation of the unseen world from the religious stand-point of the middle ages; and every great poet has given us glimpses of the higher harmonies of possible existence according with the ideas and knowledge of his age. These poets have the power, in regard to their own particular creations, of seeing with the imagination, and of imparting that power to their readers; but the truth of their imaginings, the possibility of the things imagined, can never be confounded with the results of the reason acting by observation and comparison, although the greatest minds which have added to our knowledge of the universe have occasionally possessed and exercised the power of imagining in anticipation of their discoveries. Mr. Poynting puts imaginative perception and discovery by induction on the same plane, and demands that the direct results should be the same,—as if they were parallel methods, like two modes of working an arithmetical problem. Their results, indeed, must harmonize, in so far as there is a harmony between the possible and the actual, and a consistency in both with the laws of thought and the conditions of being. That imagination may anticipate discovery may be illustrated by the case of Mr. Owen's fossil bird; but in that instance the materials were ready, the direction of the thought limited, and the conditions thus supplied waited only for the intellectual spark which the noble faculty alone could shed. The conditions of Mr. Poynting's ideal world, its laws and its ultimate purposes, are not on the level of observation and certainty, as are the truths of scientific induction and the things which are cognizable by the senses and the reason.

The value of the Second Part is unquestionably to be found

in its searching examination of the theoretic assumptions of the physical sciences. There is something almost startling in the withdrawal of the ideas of attraction and gravitation, &c., which as abstract propositions have been permitted to stand between our consciousness of the presence of God and our observation of physical phenomena, and in the demand upon our acceptance of that presence and His power as a visible cause in the universe by which we are surrounded. A cause efficient indeed, and a vera causa which is sufficient, and more than sufficient, to solve all requirements and to bring us to the ultimate analysis. But do we in fact arrive at this ultimate analysis? Is there no hiatus between the processes we perceive and the immediate presence of the Eternal? May there not be an "eidolon" in the author's own idea also,—namely, the visibility of the Eternal operation? If our spiritual perceptions were on the same plane as our physical senses, the argument would perhaps be complete. But we cannot assume this to be the case. The vera causa which is required to explain phenomena is a postulate of the reason commensurate with our perceptions, and it is no real addition to our knowledge of the lines of force (for instance) to identify the law relating to them especially with the hand of God. Are we not substituting a religious idea for a philosophical formula; and do we in fact gain anything in actual knowledge by placing the religious idea at the remote end of a line of induction? Why suppose the presence of Deity in the ultimate agency more than in the intermediate?—as the first cause, rather than in what are called secondary causes? The glory of Him who covereth Himself with light as with a garment, who stretcheth out the heavens like a curtain, is perceived and adored by the enlightened spirit of man; and no philosophical methods can impair the relations existing between the Heavenly Father and His spiritual children. It is with a deep sense of this truth, and in full sympathy with the lofty spirit of piety which pervades the volume before us, that we raise these questions on Mr. Poynting's argument. He has done a good work in producing so able a book; and he will appreciate our attempt to examine his argument more than any words of commendation which we might have bestowed on the eloquence of his style and the variety of his knowledge.

A CONCESSION.

In the Nicene Creed, that expression, which is so often wrongly read, "God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God," means absolutely nothing. There are two statements made there. The first is this, "The Son was God;" the second is this, "The Son was of God," shewing his derivation. And in that we have one of the deepest and most blessed truths of revelation. The Unitarian maintains a divine humanity—a blessed, blessed truth.—*F. W. Robertson.*

THE MIND THAT WAS IN CHRIST.

Philippians ii. 5: "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus."

In these words St. Paul has set before us the very pith and marrow of Christ's religion. Even in the darkest ages of the Church, the necessity of being like Christ was never disputed. There may have been numerous controversies respecting what Christ has said and what Christ has done, but scarcely has there been any difference of opinion respecting what he morally was. Indeed, so life-like is the character of Christ, that the facts of his history which bring before us the *beginning* and *end* of his career are lost sight of, and we think of him as a permanent possession of the world, and still a living presence.

This wonder and admiration is not without danger; it may begin and end in itself, and turn us aside from the great Christian work of becoming ourselves Christ-like. There is not perhaps much danger of a literal imitation of Christ taking place, as the circumstances that surround us are so different. We live not in a land of prophets, where every mountain tells its tale of faithful utterance, and speaks of an integrity and truthfulness that could face a monarch's wrath, and be as unmoved as the rock upon which the prophet planted his foot! We walk not in the solitudes where David sang, nor stand upon the spot where Solomon worshiped! Nor are we lying beneath the shade of Roman greatness, with a tyrant's sceptre speaking to us of a glory departed, and of woes and oppressions yet to come. These were the circumstances that closed around the Jewish Christ, and cut out for him an especial path of duty, and laid upon him the burden of a specific mission. His work, therefore, was his own, was what no one else could do, and of this fact he was ever conscious; and knowing that "the Father had given all things into his hands," it was the great anxiety of his life "to finish the work" which his Father had given him to do. There was a portion of his sorrow he could not tell, there were times when Jesus wept and there was no faithful eye to mark the tear, there were times of travail and struggle when that great soul "trod the wine-press alone."

Jesus might have adopted the language of the ancient prophet and have said, "Come, see if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow." A high spiritual development brings a sorrow as profound as its joys are high and lofty, and it is therefore only in a subordinate degree that Christians can suffer with their Lord, or share with him his future glory. Yet the precept has a meaning, "Let the same mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus." The essential elements of mind are ever the same; and this applies to devout feelings and impressions and to holy and heavenly purposes, as well as to those which are more earthly and temporary

in their origin, nature and tendency. This idea runs through the apostolic precept, and by it we are taught not to look for the same circumstances as those of Christ, to remember that he was the Master and we are his servants, that he was the Lord and we are the disciples, that he was the Vine and we are the branches, that he was the Shepherd and we are the sheep,—that we are to remember, in fact, where we differ, where we cannot be alike, that we may more successfully occupy the common ground of both, and feel the true bond of our union. That bond is mental; there we are to seek the root of all Christian goodness; and unless we make it our aim that our minds become like Christ's in their essential elements, we have little chance of becoming Christian in the true sense of the word, and our fellowship with the Son of God will be remote and feeble. What is called nearness to Christ can thus only be attained, and without this state of mind it would be a barren privilege to sit on his right hand or on his left in the kingdom of his glory. It was by the state of his mind that Jesus was so near to God, that he was said to "dwell in the bosom of the Father." And it was also a mental condition that separated the Scribes and the Pharisees of that age from the highest spiritual truth, and made them cold, heartless formalists where they might have felt the fire of heavenly love. They paced with Jesus the same temple courts, they looked upon the same holy of holies, they studied the same prophetic lore, they listened to the same temple music as it rolled through Hebrew psalms, and basked in the same serene light of the Sabbath sun, when the quiet hours of the holy day brought rest to the children of toil, to the burdened cattle, and to the exile and wanderer within the Jewish gates. Yet what different results followed! The prophet brought no spiritual insight to the Pharisee, who was busy in studying rubrics and paying tithe; and holy prayer and solemn psalm gave neither the quiet of trust nor the stimulus of aspiration to the quibbling sophists of that day, more anxious to ensnare and perplex than to seek and find the truth, and who found at last in their own sophistry an entangling web that stopped their own progress and cut them off from the freedom of all new developments of truth. How many eyes had looked upon the holy city from the Mount of Olives, but had no tears for its future, because they had neither the anxiety nor the sympathy of love! How many, too, had looked upon the multitude, had marked the popular eye destitute of the fire of intelligence, and had seen how aimless, how totally devoid of purpose was the life of the mass, and yet had no compassion and ministered not to either physical or spiritual wants! Men were hungry and they fed them not, naked and they clothed them not, sick and in prison and they visited them not. Again, there were some who could not be ignorant of the fact that the "priests' lips had ceased to keep knowledge,"

that beneath the sacerdotal vestments there were cold and stony hearts with whom religion was a mere social interest, and had neither the majesty of principle nor the tenderness of sentiment, while rites and ceremonies were followed as so many stage directions, or as the Roman soldier passed through his drill and observed the beat of his march. Yet there was only one spirit that had the courage to face and rebuke these sleepy guardians of a holy trust, and take up their charge where they left it, and do the most important part of their work, instruct the ignorant, reclaim the wanderer, confirm the waverer, comfort the mourner, strengthen the timid, alarm the careless and the sinful, and reprove and admonish the wicked, sometimes with the tone of a tender love, and at others with the thunder of an awful indignation. Now what was the secret force which produced such results? Clearly, in one case there was a mind open to the tenderest impressions, combined with an earnest desire to do battle with the social evils that were shutting men out from the highest good. With the greatest tenderness and gentleness there was a courage which priestly power could not daunt, the firmness which meekness often manifests when it reposes upon what is felt and known to be right and true. The secret source of strength is, in fact, a mind that rests upon something greater than itself, looks for guidance and strength to the highest, is fed, indeed, by the richest of all nurture, and accordingly is courageous and strong.

If, therefore, we would be true followers of Christ, we must make it the leading aim of life to have similar minds. As he studied his *own* times, so must we study *ours*, and be less concerned for the goodness that is *gone* and the vice and sin that is *dead*, than for the pure and virtuous lives that *now* shed their genial light, and the vicious and corrupting elements which spread darkness and wretchedness through nations and churches, and finally through families, till they reach the lonely spirit which thinks its own bitter thoughts and cherishes its own secret serpent that bites and devours. We are talking of Adam's sin, and Abraham's falsehood, and Noah's intemperance, while these evils are living and fresh before us. The liar's utterance might be the last thing we heard, and the drunkard's brawl and degradation the leading fact of yesterday's history.

Now here, surely, it is easy and practical to be Christ-like. The harvests of past times have all been reaped, and the fruitful fields of coming ages will not find idle hands; but look and see your *own* "fields are already white unto the harvest," and labourers are wanted; the vineyard is open still to all who are ready to work; there are blind men crying that they may receive their sight, lepers that would fain wash and be clean, widowed hearts that are open to receive the rich drops of Christian consolation, and there are men sleeping in deeper graves than were ever hewn out of Jewry's rocks, but which may still be recalled to life by

a voice that is charged and intoned with the love of a genuine Christian heart. We need not wander to Ezekiel's valley to find dry bones; and the prophet's God is with *us*, and will hear the same prayer of faith, and clothe our skeletons with beauty, and breathe into them the breath of life.

We cannot doubt there lies before us a Christ-like work, that we have blind men who need light, and sinners that need salvation. Generation after generation is melting away, unblest and unsaved; still there are scorners of the truth and despisers of the cross, fools who say in their hearts there is no God, "rich men who oppress," and poor men "who steal and take the name of the Lord in vain;" and why does the great work remain undone, and what can awaken the Church from the deep sleep into which she has fallen, while sin and death are so busy, and the rank harvest of evil is growing around? The answer to this question is as easy as it is obvious,—for a Christ-like work we must have a Christ-like mind. There must be a faith as large, or we shall stop in the very beginning, when we see how malignant is sin, how deep the sleep into which men have fallen, how wide and profound the spiritual disease that has been transmitting itself age after age, blinding men's intellects, crippling their wills and cankering their very hearts. Here science may well pause and say, "This is not my work." Legislation may enact severer laws, may provide wiser arrangements, and will at best only touch the very surface of the evil.

This deep social malady must be confronted by a more penetrating force—one, too, that can close upon it without fear and without doubt. Where sages and legislators may fail, where worldly wisdom may be baffled and worldly power may be defeated, "the mind which was also in Christ Jesus" will be triumphant, and "the love that is stronger than death" will melt the heart that sin has hardened, and cleanse the soul which vice has polluted.

But there also comes a time to all of us when nature has no more to give, when we shall have plucked her last fruits and seen her last sun set. When we reach the margin of existence in the present world and feel death's cold hand upon us, what then will best fit us for the ordeal through which we must pass? Can the arts rise in their beauty before dying eyes; can science, strong in her victories, loosen the grasp of the last enemy; can the rich man's gold bribe the spoiler, or the powerful man's influence act like a spell upon this remorseless destroyer? We know that here all such strength becomes weakness, and if victory is to be gained, no mere worldly strength must be employed. But if we have "the same mind that was also in Christ Jesus," what shall silence its voice of comfort, what shall eclipse that light which God commanded to shine out of darkness, which hath shined into the Christian heart to give the light of the knowledge

of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ? What can quench the thoughts and aspirations which the present world has never been able to satisfy, or cloud over the hopes that have been brighter than the stars of a dark night? What can still the throbbings of the faithful, filial heart that has felt a Father's mercies in sorrows, his wise appointments in afflictions, his chastisement in grief, his purposes in all changes, his bounty in all blessings? To such a mind, life has been the appointed pathway, and death the final gate that opens to the Father's house on high.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN A KENTISH RECTOR AND ONE OF HIS PARISHIONERS.

SIR,

BEING one of those who cannot approve of the National Church (as it is most inappropriately called), knowing well its exclusive and tyrannical spirit, manifested especially in small towns and rural districts, nor of the presumptuous arrogance of its clergy, who are ever ready to stigmatize all as heretics and irremediably lost who cannot subscribe to their theological dogmas, I shall feel obliged by your giving a space in the Reformer to the following correspondence, which passed between the rector of a small coast-town in Kent and one of his most influential and valuable parishioners, whose orthodoxy was suspected,—a correspondence which I venture to think will neither be uninteresting nor unedifying to your readers.

LIBERTAS.

From Rev. J. M. N—— to George H——, Esq.

Rectory, ——, Feb. 17, 1860.

My dear Sir,—It is not altogether strange or unreasonable that the death of neighbours or parishioners should suggest to my mind the thought, How would it be with this person or that, if he were to die? Die he must (no one can tell how soon); but what preparation is he making for himself after death? Of his property he may have disposal; but what preparation has he made *for himself?* Now Christianity claims to be the guide for man in all such matters; and (making so great a claim) it must either be *a vast imposture,* which has beguiled some of the best, the wisest and the most distinguished of men, or it must be a great truth.

You, my dear Sir, evidently, avowedly, do not believe it to be a great truth. Can you prove it to be *a great imposture?* And may I ask you, in all candour, whether in the retrospect of the *past,* dating back to the days of your father, or in the prospect of the *future,* looking forward to that which *must* come (sooner or later), you can conscientiously feel that your creed (whatever it is) gives you peace and satisfaction? If so, you cannot be offended with me for suggesting a question, the answer

to which in your mind has already been attended with so pleasurable and sincere an emotion as, "I am quite right beyond a doubt." But if (on the contrary) there should be reasonable doubt, let me ask you as a favour to consider and weigh it, until you can give yourself some more satisfactory answer to the thought, "I am a dying man—what will become of me after death?" May I ask you to peruse the accompanying volume (Rawlinson's Bampton Lectures)? I was in the act of reading it, and have not yet finished it, when the thought of writing to you occurred to me. It is written by one of the greatest scholars of the day. The argument can only be refuted by proving that Christianity is based upon an historical lie; and if so, how is the fact of its existence to be accounted for? The invention of the whole as a fiction is more extraordinary and incredible than the admission of it as a fact. My excuse for writing thus to you must be, that I believe myself to be right in the opinion that Christianity is an incontrovertible *truth*.

Supposing (as a mere hypothesis) that *I* have been foolishly deluded, what shall I be the worse for my credulity? If (on the other hand) *you* believe your opinions to be incontrovertibly true, and supposing (as an hypothesis) that you are wrong, what will *you* be the worse for your unbelief?

My error (according to your showing) would be comparatively harmless; your error (according to the state of the case) would be most dangerous. I hope you will not think of me as the worse friend for having written thus plainly. As a physician of the soul, I believe you in great danger.

Yours sincerely,

J. M. N——.

From G. H——, Esq., to Rev. J. M. N——.

U. D., Feb. 19, 1860.

My dear Sir,—To reply in a full and satisfactory manner to your note of yesterday, would involve an amount of controversy which would be as tiresome to you to peruse as it would be irksome to me to engage in. I shall therefore be as brief as possible, and confine myself to the topics introduced by yourself.

You address yourself to me as "a physician of the soul, believing me in great danger." I do not quarrel with you for entertaining this view; but I submit that your style of accosting your patient is singularly infelicitous, and that you have made a very inaccurate diagnosis of the disease. You imagine me to disclaim Christianity as a "guide for man in making preparation for himself after death," as rejecting it as "a vast imposture," "evidently and avowedly not believing it to be a great truth." Now I never had but one conversation with you on the subject, and I am quite sure no such sentiments escaped my lips; and if any one has informed you that I have indulged or expressed such views, he has practised upon your credulity.

The head and front of my offending is, that I exercise the right, early inculcated upon me as a duty, and assumed by Protestants of every persuasion, of estimating for myself what is the essence of Christianity. I find a dozen schemes, each differing from the other,—even the same Church propounding conflicting articles in different parts of its services; I find these schemes severally upheld with equal learning, with equal tenacity, and, I am sorry to say, with equal intemperance; and I am

forced to do, what I believe every man of reflection does, either covertly or overtly, i.e. to frame for myself, as best I may, out of this chaotic and contradictory mass, what I must call, for want of a better name, an *eclectic Christianity*.

It is very possible that in this process I may discard elements which to you appear essential, just as your essentials may appear to me mere dross or scum. But while I hold all authoritative text-built systems of theology in the most perfect contempt, I have never entertained a thought or spoken a word in disparagement or irreverence of Christianity or religion. I often, indeed, wonder, and always feel thankful, that I have not fallen into complete scepticism; for it has been my misfortune to read a great deal of acrimonious controversy, and I have found that positiveness of assertion and censure of opponents have always been in the inverse ratio of the probability and reasonableness of the doctrines at issue.

You ask me if "my creed, whatever it is, gives me peace and satisfaction." May I ask, in return, whether you mean to infer that the proper *test* of the truth of any doctrine is the peace and satisfaction which it yields? I presume you hold the doctrine of the eternal punishment of millions of souls in hell. Is it impertinent to inquire what amount of peace and satisfaction you derive from this awful view of Divine vengeance? On the other hand, the Catholic believes in purgatory, penance and the intercession of saints—*all true doctrines*, if judged by the degree of comfort they afford to the pious worshiper. But without adverting further to the logic of the matter, it may be professional, but it is very unfair, to menace a man with endless reprobation on the ground of his speculative religious opinions, and in the same breath to inquire, "How do you feel yourself now?" To suggest, or rather to assure a man, ex cathedrâ, that he is a lost soul, and to expect that he will receive the announcement with unruffled composure, is contrary to all psychological experience; but to interpret that transient emotion of uneasiness as a smiting of conscience and as a practical renunciation of his principles, is a combined act of ignorance and injustice.

I know it is a part of the treatment recognized by the orthodox physician of the soul in the case of all who deviate from the prescribed routine of thought, to keep such, if possible, under a continual blister; and the unhappy patient is taught in numberless ways that the penalties of his recusancy, although they are to be continued by the Almighty in another world, are to be commenced by his fellow-men in the present one. But to give a direct and decisive answer to your question, "Does my creed, whatever it is, give me peace and satisfaction?" I can truly and sincerely say that it does. The "retrospect of the past" does, I confess, often bring back the dark shadow of many an action which I cannot review without grief and mortification. On that score no one can be a severer judge than I am myself. But I have never yet felt a pang of conscience for errors of religious belief. The *acts* of my life were voluntary; the good and the bad were open to my choice; but intellectual decisions are obedient to no control but that of stern reason, and it is a perversion of all the moral sentiments to classify errors of the intellect with deliberate and wilful sins.

It would be prolix to explain the links of connection between my creed and my happiness; I will simply say that *your* solution of the

phenomenon, "that it results from the pleasurable emotion that I am quite right beyond a doubt," is altogether without foundation. I utterly disclaim any such conceit. I am so thoroughly convinced that I see only in part and know only in part, and that, with a very limited range of faculty, I am called upon to form some opinion on subjects of the most profound significancy, that I estimate my decision at a very low value; indeed, its only value to me is, that it is the best I can form after an unbiassed and not uncareful investigation. But while I embrace what appears to me the truth with firmness, I cast no reflection and impute no blame on those who arrive at the most contrary conclusions. That "every one should be fully persuaded in his own mind" is a most wholesome suggestion, and may be extended with advantage to all questions, both of philosophy and theology.

You speak as if a man could make or unmake his belief at pleasure, and that as it can be shewn that his safety lies in believing in a certain manner, his sense of self-interest ought at once to decide the direction of his belief. I cannot explain the constitution and action of other minds; but I find it impossible, in my own case, to reverse the judgments of my conscience for any bribe, present or future. I can indeed assume an external profession and act the part of a conformist; but you would be the last man to recommend a duplicity which old Homer could reprove:

> "Who dares think one thing and another tell,
> My soul abhors him as the gates of hell."

In direct opposition to your view, it has been well said, that "no inquirer after truth can fix thereon a direct and clear-sighted gaze, who is casting side-glances all the while on the prospect of his soul."

I have already exceeded my proposed limits. I will only allude to what appears to me the weak logic of one of your sentences. You say, "the fact of Christianity proves its truth." How will you dispose of the Mahometan religion, of Buddhism, and of other wide-spread superstitions?

In conclusion, I beg to say that I take no offence at your addressing me as you have done. I think you vastly mistaken; but I certainly do not reciprocate your alarm, any more than I should do if you blundered in a mathematical demonstration. And as you have lent me a book for my guidance, perhaps you will allow me to recommend the perusal of the accompanying volume (Martineau's Rationale of Religious Inquiry), which has given me much pleasure and instruction.

I am, &c. &c.,

G. H.

IGNORANT INFALLIBILITY.

Men generally find it most easy to explain everything who are ignorant of everything.—*Sir H. Davy.*

CORRESPONDENCE.

REV. WILLIAM HINCKS AND MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE.

SIR,

MR. HINCKS' letter in your last number renders necessary a few words from me. I never saw the statement by Mr. Kenrick in which Mr. Hincks' name is mentioned until it appeared in print, but my own recollection of the facts is entirely in accordance with the account given by Mr. Kenrick.

All the correspondence upon the subject of Mr. Hincks' resignation passed through my hands. I was also present at all meetings of the College Committee, and the minutes of proceedings of the Committee were made by me or under my immediate superintendence. Probably, therefore, I have better means than Mr. Hincks possessed of knowing the circumstances under which the removal of the College from York took place. Mr. Hincks' resignation certainly was founded, in his correspondence with the Committee, upon dissatisfaction with his pecuniary position at York, which had been the subject of voluminous correspondence for years previously; and his determination to resign upon that ground had been two or three times previously expressed and subsequently withdrawn. I have not the least hesitation in saying that Mr. Hincks' avowed dissatisfaction with his position hastened the removal of the College from York, and closed Mr. Wellbeloved's connection with the Institution at an earlier period than would otherwise have been the case. In fact, Mr. Hincks' retirement, before any decision as to the future locality or position of the College had been in any way arrived at, placed the Committee in a position of considerable difficulty, and obliged them to make a temporary arrangement with the Rev. J. H. Ryland for carrying on the domestic establishment at York for one year after Mr. Hincks' departure.

I have no wish to revive any controversy on the subject with my old friend and tutor, but his denial of the correctness of Mr. Kenrick's statement obliges me to bear my testimony to its accuracy. Mr. Hincks' known dissatisfaction with his position at York had led to discussion as to what future arrangements might be desirable; but he is mistaken in supposing that any decision as to a removal had been formed until his own resignation rendered a consideration of the question necessary, and precipitated Mr. Wellbeloved's retirement.

WM. RAYNER WOOD.

Singleton, Manchester, Aug. 3, 1860.

ON NATURAL DEPRAVITY.

SIR,

I DO not think Mr. Hinton has succeeded better than other deep thinkers who have gone before him in the solution of that mystery of mysteries, Natural Depravity. When, indeed, he says that there is a principle within us which is by nature prone to sin and to estrangement from God, he states what I take to be a very evident truth. I do not

suppose that any one can deny that such is the case; the expression that we so often make use of, "the weakness of the flesh," is but another name for the same thing. There is that connected with the flesh and the world which tends to draw us away from God, something which requires always to be opposed with great effort, which makes the approach to God difficult, which renders the way to heaven, even for the innocent such as Jesus, a road of toil and suffering and beset by snares on every hand.

Mr. Hinton, I believe, considers that man may have been originally created with this tendency towards evil, instead of, as the so-called orthodox Christians hold, being at first created of a nature pure and in harmony with God, but which became depraved afterwards. I think, however, that there is more in this question of the time at which depravity commenced than Mr. Hinton imagines, for it at once involves another question of the very first interest: if he says that man was originally endowed with a disposition inclining to sin, then he must mean that he was so endowed by the hand of his Creator. But if this be his meaning, I think he must not be surprised if he finds that many of his fellow-christians cannot give him their assent, for there are many simple-minded believers who cannot look upon God as ever endowing man with what would tend to bring about estrangement from Himself; on the contrary, they can only regard Him as always seeking to draw man nearer to Himself,—nay, as having ever been the bitter opponent of this disposition to sin, as pleading with us against it, as seeking to smooth our way through it, "as fighting for us."

But Mr. Hinton says, that "this proneness [to sin] is the *natural consequence* of man's fallible endowments," and that "he *could not be* otherwise endowed." I do not think by regarding the difficulty in this way he yet acquires any logical advantage, for this is simply to say that God was necessitated to make human nature impure and inclining to sin, so that the Omnipotent had to submit to necessity, which is a contradiction.

On the other hand, the Trinitarians believe that when man was first made, human nature was pure and good, as all that comes from the hand of God must be; that afterwards he sinned, in consequence of which his nature became depraved as it now is; but that the influence that brought about this depravity was not from God, but from a power that works in opposition to God. Granting thus much, I think that what follows is not altogether without reason: if you have, on the one hand, a kind and loving Father, and, on the other hand, his children who have wandered away from Him, and who now, if they would return to Him again, can only do so by passing through a life of continued struggle and much suffering, they say that God, seeing our condition, took such pity upon us that He entered into our fallen nature Himself, He became man that He too might bear our burdens and so make them lighter for us, that he might take up the cross Himself and go before, in order to lead us back to the heaven from which we have wandered.

I do not want to be considered as pleading the cause of Trinitarianism in general; I could not ever do so; but I have only endeavoured here to give something of the rationale of Trinitarianism where I conceive it comes in contact with Mr. Hinton's views. He has advanced some views upon natural depravity which he considers might be capable of

reconciling those of the Unitarian and orthodox Christians on that subject; he invites discussion from your readers; with your kind permission, therefore, I would give some reasons why it appears to me that, as far as the orthodox Christians are concerned, he is hardly likely to gain their consent.

FIDES.

PETER AND CEPHAS.

SIR,

YOUR correspondent *Peter* cannot expect his theory to be accepted without one line of argument offered in its behalf,—the theory that Cephas whom St. Paul "withstood to the face" was not Cephas or Peter the apostle, but "an heretical Cephas." I never read this opinion before; and he who starts it should at least say what he can in its defence. Can we imagine that Paul (Gal. i. 18) went up to Jerusalem to see Cephas the heretic? What would this be to his argument, that he had not at first conferred with "flesh and blood," or derived his commission from those who "seemed to be somewhat"? And how comes this heretical Cephas to be enumerated with James and John (Gal. ii. 9) among "the pillars" of the church?

Your correspondent seems to imply that Conybeare and Howson favour his idea by reading *Cephas* instead of *Peter* in the former instance. But they preclude his fancy by their note on this very passage, as follows:

"*Cephas*, not *Peter*, is the reading of the best MSS. throughout this Epistle, as well as in the Epistles to Corinth, except in one passage, Gal. ii. 7, 8. St. Peter was ordinarily known up to this period by the Syro-Chaldaic form of his name (the name actually given by our Lord), and not by its Greek equivalent. It is remarkable that he himself, in his Epistles, uses the Greek form, perhaps as a mark of his antagonism to the Judaizers, who naturally would cling to the Hebraic form." (Note on Gal. i. 18.)

It was scarcely candid to quote Conybeare and Howson as the basis of the theory.

Then how does St. Paul's expostulation to the Corinthians run, on this new theory? "Every one of you saith, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas (the heretic), and I of Christ." Does your correspondent imply that Paul regarded the name of Apollos as heretical too? Or were they all names of true apostles and preachers, wrongly taken as party names? (1 Cor. i. 12).

We shall perhaps next hear that Saul the Jew was a different person from Paul the apostle; and Didymus, a heretic, sometimes wrongly taken for Thomas the apostle; and that the Boanerges (the sons of thunder) were different from the apostles James and John who one day proposed to call down fire from heaven on the Samaritans.

If your "Peter's" suggestion is not a mere whim, he will perhaps defend it as an opinion.

THE WRITER ON "PETER AND PAUL, THEIR ALLEGED DIFFERENCES."

Having lent your August No., I refer to "Peter's" conjecture by memory only.

[We have received from our correspondent "Peter" his promised "Pauline History of Cephas."—ED. C. R.]

CRITICAL NOTICES.

University Education in England for Natives of India, &c. By Hodgson Pratt, B.C.S. 8vo. Pp. 36. Ridgway. 1860.

THE line of demarcation or separation which divides the natives from the Europeans in British India, is alike the blot and the embarrassment of the public administration of affairs in those vast regions. The conquerors found an all-pervading curse, the curse of *caste*, with its multitudinous miseries and mischiefs, among the coloured races, and they added to it a new element,—the distinction between the dark-serving many and the white-ruling few. Equality in the eye of the law is the best evidence of good government; fraternity in the recognition of public opinion is the most satisfactory test of social progress and civilization. But the fact of *equality* and the *sentiment* of fraternity are equally wanting in India. Can they be supplied?—for until the barriers are weakened or broken down little indeed shall we advance in the way of political improvement.

Mr. Pratt brings his valuable contribution in aid of this great object. The authorities he quotes are overwhelming as to the existence and magnitude of the grievance and the necessity of its redress; and if Mr. Pratt had only collected the appendix of the *dicta* of enlightened men, he would have rendered an important service to the cause he seeks to promote. Some of the most eminent speak out boldly, and declare that we ought ever to look to the grand object of training and qualifying the natives for *self-government*. That, no doubt, is our highest and noblest mission; and if it be kept constantly and steadily in view, we shall not be led far astray.

The scheme of Mr. Pratt is simple and intelligible. He would invite the natives into the field of competition, and encourage and assist them to enter fairly and hopefully upon educational rivalry. He avoids details, but asks for the aid and counsels of those who concur in the general object, which he thinks may be best carried out by an Association, to be organized in England, and to seek co-operation from Europeans and natives at the Presidency towns in India. He looks to University education in Great Britain as the most promising means for giving effect to his views, and thinks the University of London as the seat of instruction presents the greatest amount of recommendation. He estimates the expense of student life in the metropolis at £200 a-year, and proposes that one-half be provided by the Association, and the other by "the friends of promising young men in India," to whom the Association would stand *in loco parentis*.

He does not conceal the difficulties which are presented by the social organization in India. At first it might not be easy to find appropriate candidates willing to break the bondage of *caste*, to migrate to foreign lands, to place themselves under the control of the proposed Association. But a few would present themselves, and the good fortune of the few would encourage the ambition of the many. May success attend Mr. Pratt's honourable and honouring purposes! They are well timed; they are earnestly and ably advocated.

We must find room for two extracts as specimens of the able way in which Mr. Hodgson Pratt discusses his subject. The first extract bears

on a topic of no little interest to the Unitarian body at the present time, in connection with the Transylvanians now invited over by the Unitarian Association and other bodies to come and study in our colleges and to imbibe the free and healthful spirit of English manners:

"What then is to be done? I propose that measures should be adopted for bringing to this country every year a small number of young natives of superior capacity, for the purpose of giving them a university education and the influences of English life and society. They would be men who had already completed the rudimentary part of their education in our Indian schools and colleges, and who would be ready at once to enter upon the special studies requisite for the learned Professions, the Bar, Medicine, or Divinity, as well as for Civil Engineering, while some might devote their time to the study of Commerce and Manufactures. They would, before leaving India, have received such an education as would enable them at once, on their arrival in England, to derive benefit from cultivated English society and from travel, as well as from lectures and public institutions. It will be said by objectors that there are already Universities in India by which the natives are enabled to enter upon the profession of medicine, law, or civil engineering. That is true, but what I desire to point out is that education in India is merely the education of the lecture-room, and what I want is the education of English life out of the lecture-room. In England, natives of India would have not only a higher kind of competition than in their own country, where their class-fellows are men of their own race and standing; not only the higher teaching of an English University as compared with that of a Colony; not only the higher standard of attainment so requisite; but,—what I would chiefly lay stress upon,—the free association with professors and fellow-students, with the first minds in the world."—Pp. 21, 22.

The other extract we make explains Mr. Hodgson Pratt's views of the forbearance due from Christians to Hindoos who may so far conquer the prejudices of caste and religion as to come over to us:

"I purposely say nothing as to Religion. These will be men who can judge for themselves and will occupy a position which should secure them from any impertinent attempts at propagandism. People who would resort to interference in this respect can have but little faith in God, or in the indirect testimony to the origin of our religion, which is afforded by the whole aspect of European society as contrasted with that of the East. Any misplaced and short-sighted interference in this matter would probably deter others from coming and neutralize the whole scheme. It should be considered a point of honour to leave these men to be perfectly free agents in the formation of their own conclusions on this as well as on all other points."—P. 24.

The Morals of Belief: a Letter to the Churches of the Western Unitarian Christian Union, read before their Half-yearly Meeting, held at Bridport, Wednesday, May 23rd, 1860. By Edward Higginson, of Swansea. 8vo. Pp. 24. London—Whitfield.

The recent custom of our Western churches of having, in addition to a Sermon, a Letter at one of their half-yearly meetings, "with reference to the wants of the body or the circumstances of the times," would seem to indicate the consciousness on the part of our friends in the West of large intellectual and spiritual resources on the one hand, and vigorous spiritual digestion on the other. It is, with a variation, a revival of the old Puritan practice of a double lecture. The theory of a Letter as distinguished from a Sermon we suppose to be, that to the former a greater latitude is given in topic and illustration than, by some at least

amongst us, would be thought suitable in a pulpit address. Practically, we fear that the arrangement will lead to a waste of power. Englishmen seldom attend to two subjects at once. The clever Letter will, we imagine, push the Sermon to the wall, or the powerful Sermon will make the members of the Union forget the Letter. If, indeed, as might be the case, the Letter were prepared by one of the accomplished and thoughtful laymen who are the strength and ornament of our churches, we should see advantages that would more than compensate for the inconvenience of the system of riding double. Perhaps the hint may be adopted, and at future meetings of the Western Union carefully-prepared addresses may be procured which shall illustrate the lay as well as the clerical aspect of the great religious topics of the day. We would put ourselves to some inconvenience to listen to a Lay Sermon or a Pastoral Letter from Sir John Bowring, Mr. Ainsworth, Mr. George Long, Mr. E. W. Field, Dr. William Carpenter, and other able laymen amongst us, whose voices we hear less frequently than we desire. Certain we are that our ministers would gladly welcome such coadjutors into the field.

We are happy in the opportunity of making these remarks when they cannot be supposed to have a personal application. All who were hearers of the sermon at Bridport spoke its praises; and no one who reads this Letter will regret that the intellectual and spiritual banquet provided for the guests on that occasion was so various and rich.

There has been so much criticism on ourselves and our deficiencies, and the result has been so considerable an amount of one-sided statement, that Mr. Higginson shewed great practical wisdom in selecting for his Letter a subject which necessitated a large and comprehensive view of spiritual and ecclesiastical relations. His first remarks in explanation of his selected subject hit the capital blot of too many churches.

"THE ESSENTIAL NATURE OF BELIEF AND CONVICTION *is wholly overlooked and unheeded by the world in general, and ignored by the religious world in particular.* Amid all the religious zeal, the earnest proselytism, the undoubted spiritual life, and the self-denying exertions of churches and individuals, the philosophy of opinions is totally repudiated, the morality of belief, unbelief, and various belief, is slighted and trampled in the dust. There is, in fact, little real, sound, deep belief amid the clamorous demand for it;—there is little, comparatively, that deserves the name of belief, if belief includes intelligent personal conviction. There are prejudices; there are notions; there are impressions, fancies, feelings, all calling themselves beliefs; there are dogmas, there are creeds, there are traditions; there are earnest exhortations to believe, and as earnest denunciations against the sin or danger of doubting or disbelieving; there is what calls itself the assurance of faith, and what believes itself to be the special doctrinal suggestion of the Holy Spirit; but how little is there that can be called clear and intelligent individual conviction!"—Pp. 5, 6.

Mr. Higginson condenses the true philosophy of opinions into these five propositions:

"I. That opinions, to be worth calling opinions, ought to be transparently sincere; and, for the sake of sincerity, their profession should be unmixed with worldly considerations and unbiassed by worldly interests.—II. That they should be the result of intelligent personal inquiry and conviction.—III. That they be held without any implied sense of spiritual merit for holding them, or penal threat of spiritual danger for rejecting them.—IV. That they be avowed and followed out in practice.

"By the first rule we stipulate for the *reality* of opinions; by the second, for their *active mindedness* and prevailing *rationality*; by the third, for their *breadth or liberality*; and by the fourth, for their *practical application*. And, under these self-evident conditions of philosophy and good morals, it follows as a fifth principle,—V. That the particular belief resulting cannot be essential to any one's spiritual safety; and that salvation by a particular creed is a cruel and immoral notion."—Pp. 6, 7.

In a series of vigorous remarks, our author shews most clearly that the true ethics of belief are impugned by *Conformity* to a Church which demands the profession and acceptance of very many controverted propositions; by the pretensions of *Orthodoxy*, which makes mere matters of opinion essential elements of individual salvation; and also by that *False Liberalism* which says it matters not what opinions a man professes or holds.

With the pencil of a master, Mr. Higginson sketches in bold outline the several parties in the Church of England, viz., 1, the High Church party, with its firm retention of ceremony and its opposition to individual judgment; 2, the Evangelical Church party, with its moderate sacerdotal claims and orthodox rigour of doctrine; 3, the Broad Church party, which begins by accepting a narrow creed, and then applies to it a lax belief and a broad system of interpretation. In the delineation of the Dissenting communities, Mr. Higginson is less striking. He wanted for an efficient picture here a broader canvas than he allowed himself. We will honestly confess we could have spared the details he has given us of the despicable arts of the mountebanks and clowns who make the pulpit their stage, and are most successful when they set the assembled worshipers on the grin.

We should have preferred the total omission of his sketch of "the funny pulpit," in order that attention might have been better given to his admirable remarks on the *Non-sectarian* and *Philosophical* Church, and that he might have felt himself at liberty to amplify his remarks upon this interesting portion of his subject.

"Another movement of our day is the, so-called, *Non-sectarian Church*—which yet cannot help being a sect just as much as any other, for it dissents from the Establishment, and again separates from all those who profess Trinitarianism, and also from those who profess Unitarianism, while apparently desiring 'the distinction of having nothing distinctive about it.' Yet it is practically Unitarian all the while, being Christian and not Orthodox. In some cases it escapes the stigma of that unpopular name; and its leaders are much given to the admiration of those *Broad-churchmen* whose beliefs are perhaps as vague as theirs, but whose principle of action is quite different, as it permits them to eat the Church's bread while denying her dogmas. I presume to judge no man's conscience by my own. I only say, this movement for an unsectarian Church, so far as it reaches, tends to confuse the philosophy and morals of belief and opinions, instead of helping to clear them.

"The '*Philosophical*' school of religious thought—if we must for a moment (which I do not willingly) yield that name for the mere sake of description—appears to me to lie under the same imputation of neglecting the high morals, if not also confounding the clear logic, of opinion (religious opinion especially) both in its constant eulogies upon the hollow theology of the 'Broad-church' clergy, and also in its own mode of treating questions of Christian evidences, Christian inspiration, and scriptural authority and credibility. All these questions ought indeed to be philosophically discussed; and the honest rejecter of the Christian religion, if he remain a good and religious man, would, of course, always have our manly respect and approval. But we

find such novel meanings attaching themselves insidiously to the well-understood words *natural* and *supernatural*, as to confuse instead of clearing the question of the Gospel miracles;—*Inspiration* has been so described as to be distinctive of no man, though being applied to every man;—scriptural facts have been gnosticised into inward beliefs, and the antiquity and trustworthiness of the Gospel and Apostolic histories been studiously set so low, in defiance of the most ancient testimonies, that it seems difficult, on these views, to know whether we have an historical Christianity or not. Yet descriptive terms should have a meaning; and, the claims of meritorious or safe belief being once repudiated, it should be easy for Philosophy, Natural Religion and the Gospel to hold their own respectively."—Pp. 20, 21.

We believe with Mr. Higginson that it is the function of the Unitarian Church to teach the world a true morality in respect to the ethics of belief. We may not have applied our own principles correctly in every instance, we may have failed in reaching some important doctrine, but that we have in free inquiry and open profession of opinion the best possible theological apparatus, and that the final result will be TRUTH, we cannot doubt.

So highly do we appreciate the general justness and the vigour of Mr. Higginson's remarks, that we wish his Letter could become a pastoral to churches in the north, the south and the east, as well as to those in the west.

The Present Relations of Science to Religion. A Sermon preached on Act Sunday, July 1, 1860, *before the University of Oxford, during the Meeting of the British Association.* By the Rev. Frederick Temple, D.D., Head Master of Rugby School. Printed by request. Pp. 18. Oxford and London—Parker. 1860.

Not often is it the lot of a minister of religion to address a more remarkable or highly cultivated audience than that which assembled on the 1st of July in St. Mary's at Oxford. In addition to the Vice-Chancellor and other members of the University, most of the illustrious men whom the British Association had congregated in Oxford were there. There were also there probably not less than a hundred clergymen and other minsters of religion. After the morning prayers were read, with a slovenly indifference, by the clergyman of the day, Dr. Temple, the accomplished Master of Rugby, ascended the pulpit. The bidding prayer, in which he commemorated departed University founders, and especially them of Balliol College (a piece of ecclesiastical barbarism worthy of the middle ages), was a strange introduction to the thoughtful, bold and masterly discourse which is now before us, "printed by request." He paid a becoming compliment to his audience by taking as the subject of his sermon the Relations of Religion and Science, having especially in his view the changes which science is producing in them.

"Science has been called the handmaid of theology, and theology has often had recourse to science for arguments to prove or confirm her fundamental propositions. But it is remarkable that theology has almost always for this purpose dwelt chiefly not on the scientific, but on the unscientific statements of science. Arguments have been commonly extracted not from the revelations of science, but from her confessions; and theology has begun where science has ended."—P. 6.

Dr. Temple puts himself in direct opposition to the fashionable spiritual school, who treat the supremacy of Law in creation and nature as

an irreligious and dangerous theory. He vindicates the principle of Law, to which all scientific analogy points, from the charge of tending to Pantheism. He shews, by a train of reasoning beautifully clear, that the fixed laws of nature revealed by science not only supply numberless illustrations of the attributes of God, but also "suggest the analogy by which we can rise above themselves to that higher law" in which we see the presence of a personal God.

Never in our hearing has the subject of the relation which exists between revelation and science been treated by a clergyman of the English Church more boldly, or with a courage more truly wise, than by Dr. Temple on this occasion:

"There was a time when the spheres of these two were distinct; or, if there were ever an appearance of collision, science was required to give place. That time ceased with Galileo, and can never return. The student of science now feels himself bound by the interests of truth, and can admit no other obligation. And if he be a religious man, he believes that both books, the book of Nature and the book of Revelation, come alike from God, and that he has no more right to refuse to accept what he finds in the one than what he finds in the other. The two books are indeed on totally different subjects; the one may be called a treatise on physics and mathematics, the other a treatise on theology and morals. But they are both by the same Author; and the difference in their importance is derived from the difference in their matter, and not from any difference in their authority. Whenever, therefore, there is a collision between them, the dispute becomes simply a question of evidence. Here, you have in nature God's handiwork; there, you have in the Bible the message which He commissioned certain servants of His to give you. They do not appear to agree. Now, on the one side, are you quite certain in your interpretation of His handiwork? on the other, are you quite certain that you are not mixing up with His message some extraneous matter which belongs not to the message, but to the messenger? In the case of Galileo the question has been answered; the astronomer was right, the theologians were wrong. The apparent statement that the sun went round the earth is now acknowledged to belong to the messenger, not to the message; to the language, not to the substance. The present state of science indicates that there will be more answers in the same direction. Geology, for instance, has already altered our conception of a great part of the Book of Genesis. Researches into ancient records seem likely to affect the details of the history of the early races of mankind. How each one of the many questions thus started will be ultimately answered it is impossible to say. The probability is that both the agreements and the discrepancies between science and the Biblical narrative will be very different from what we now suppose: but, at any rate, it is tolerably plain that the Bible is not to look to science for that confirmation of minute details which not very long ago was confidently expected, and in many cases apparently produced.

"Is there, then, no harmony between the Bible and science? Are they, if not foes, yet so distinct as to have no point of meeting? Not so. But this harmony is to be looked for in a different direction; not in petty details of fact are we to find it, but in the deep identity of tone, character, and spirit which pervade both the books."—Pp. 14, 15.

We would gladly, if our decreasing space permitted, quote the beautiful illustrations (pp. 15—17) which Dr. Temple offers of the united testimony which the book of Nature and the Bible offer of the patience and the munificent bountifulness of God, the adaptation of his works and his word to human feelings, and the sternness with which disobedience to law, whether natural or moral, is rebuked.

"The more the Bible is studied, and the more nature is studied, the deeper

will be found the harmony between them in character, the more assured the certainty that whoever inspired the one also made the other. And most assured will that certainty be in the mind of him who studies the Bible as it was meant to be studied, not as an interesting historical record, but as the guide of life, the revelation of spiritual truth, the awakener and the kindler of religious inspiration."—P. 17.

Our extracts have been sufficient to shew that Dr. Temple did justice to an occasion such as cannot often fall to the lot even of the most gifted ministers of religion. As he listened to that wise and eloquent discourse, the man of science must have felt that religion was a domain as full of interest and as deserving of his respect as the other departments of the works of the Creator; and the religious man must have felt that science, however it may confute folly and rebuke superstition, may yet be the handmaid of a pure and true theology.

An American View of the Causes which have led to the Decline of the Society of Friends in Great Britain and Ireland. Pp. 32. London—Bennett. 1860.

THE Society of Friends has rendered too many important services to the world to allow us to look with indifference on their possible extinction. Many, and some not unfounded, objections may be made to the mystical style of thought and uncouth speech and dress and other habits of this singular people; but these are mere specks in the sun when we remember their noble fidelity to principle and their laborious and truly catholic philanthropy. That the Friends have diminished and are diminishing in England is admitted. The cause of the decline has been recently made the subject of inquiry and dissertation in certain Prize Essays. The limitation of the inquiry to the United Kingdom appears to the writer of the pamphlet, the title of which we give above, unduly to limit the investigation, and to prevent the proper issue being raised.

In America, the Quakers do not diminish; and there at least we may indulge the hope that they will continue to protest in behalf of the spirituality of religion, of a free Christian ministry, and against war, capital punishments, oaths and slavery.

In Great Britain and Ireland, it is supposed that the whole number of Quakers little exceeds 18,000, whereas in the lifetime of George Fox they numbered 40,000. In America, there are three distinct organizations of the Society of Friends, their number amounting to 150,000.

The author traces the decline in England to three causes: 1. The increase of wealth and the worldly spirit. 2. An approximation to the doctrines of the Established Church. 3. Disownment by marriage. The remarks on the second head have most interest to us. The early Quakers differed from orthodox Christians on the doctrines of the Trinity, original sin and imputed righteousness, doctrines which they denied; and, on the other hand, they maintained the universal and saving light of Christ. During the present century, and especially the second quarter of it, the preaching and writings of the late Joseph John Gurney exercised over his religious body great influence, leading them to what are considered "evangelical" views of faith. To this influence the author before us attributes the absorption by the evangelical party of the Church of a considerable number of the Society of Friends. He maintains that the doctrine of Joseph John Gurney differed from early

Friends on these four heads,—the Trinity, original sin, imputed righteousness, and the atonement with its several branches of doctrine. How our author treats his subject will be sufficiently shewn by a single extract.

"The doctrine of the Trinity, or tri-personality of the Deity, was denied by the early Friends. They acknowledged the scriptural doctrine of Father, Word, and Spirit; but they rejected the term 'person' as applied to them, and they insisted that 'these three are one.' Not three *persons*, but one indivisible and omnipresent Spirit, who created the world, who enlightened the minds of the holy men of old, who 'was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself,' and 'who is not far from every one of us, for in Him we live, and move, and have our being.' George Fox, in many passages, controverts the doctrine of three persons in the Godhead. In reply to Christopher Wade, he says: 'Thou knowest not Him that is in the Father, and the Father in Him, glorified with the Father before the world began. And the Scripture doth not tell people of a Trinity, nor three persons, but the Common Prayer mass-book speaks of three persons brought in by thy father the Pope; and the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, was always one.' Joseph John Gurney, on the contrary, held the common Trinitarian doctrine, although he did not use the word Trinity. He speaks of the 'personality of the Holy Spirit,' and thinks the apostles 'regarded the Holy Spirit as one possessing a personal authority, exercising personal powers, and requiring a personal allegiance.' In treating of the Supreme Being, he writes of 'the personality and unity in Him of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit.'"—Pp. 20, 21.

We have been greatly interested by the whole of this pamphlet, which abounds with opinions sincerely and earnestly expressed. The author is anxious for the continuance of the Society, which has, he believes, an important mission, as yet only partially fulfilled. He thinks that if Friends will return to the simplicity of their founders, and keep fearlessly free from the popular theology, and trust not so much to schemes of doctrine intellectually or textually elaborated, as to the overflowing of divine love in the heart, they may yet do a great work, and prove that their doctrine and discipline are, more than in any other sect, in accordance with Christian principles.

Reasons why I am a Unitarian, in a Series of Letters to a Friend. By John R. Beard, D.D. Second Edition. London—Simpkin, Marshall and Co. 1860.

During the time that we have unwillingly delayed our review of this vigorous apology for Unitarian Christianity, a not small edition of it has been absorbed by the public; and we hasten to notice it (our space forbids a lengthened review), lest it should by our further delay reach a third edition before its merits are spoken of in our pages. In less than 100 pages, Dr. Beard gives us twelve letters, in which the characteristics of Unitarianism are so described that every reader may thoroughly understand the subject. The diversities as well as the agreements of Unitarians are candidly stated. Unitarianism is described as worthy of the Christian's acceptance, because it is intelligible, real and reasonable; because, being true, it is positive, permanent and fitted to become universal; because it is favourable to freedom, and while essentially scriptural is yet progressive; because it is practical and salutary, conducive to piety, honourable to the Saviour and promotive of holiness. Such a religion makes polytheism abhorrent to the mind, and is a pre-

servative from the metaphysical snares of pantheism. Unitarianism necessarily tends to free the mind from the bonds of a sectarian spirit. The importance of Unitarianism is further manifested in being the most ancient form of Christianity, and so leading the mind and heart directly to Christ. Such a religion must be sufficient for man, and will prove the central point of the one universal church. These are the principal heads under which Dr. Beard ranges his proofs from reason and scripture in behalf of Unitarianism.

The passage which we select as a specimen of our author's mode of conducting his argument, relates to polytheism and pantheism.

"Trinitarianism ever tends to polytheism, with no small risk to end in pantheism. It ever tends to polytheism. There is but one branch of the entire Church in which Trinitarianism is what it was, retaining all the qualities of its fully developed form. That form is Roman Catholicism. Here, then, we may see Trinitarianism, as in its perfect condition, so in its natural fruits. Accordingly, here are 'gods many and lords many,' not less than in the heathenism described by Paul. Besides the greater gods, the Roman pantheon is crowded with demi-gods, heroes, local gods, gods of nations, gods of individuals. To the long-recognised number of the greater gods, another has, in process of time, been added; and as in ancient days Zeus dethroned Chronos, so now Mary eclipses the three persons of the Trinity. Even in Protestant Trinitarianism a somewhat similar result is observed, for now the Father is practically supreme, and now the Son, while the Holy Ghost finds little beyond a nominal recognition.

"Facts such as these can little satisfy the logical demands of philosophical speculation. Accordingly, in Germany, Trinitarianism has begotten pantheism, while pantheism adopts the nomenclature of Trinitarianism. What, in the mouths of Hegel and Strauss, is the Trinity but the passage of the subject into the object? The Father is the Infinite which, through the Holy Ghost, becomes the Son; while, reversely, the Son, through the Holy Ghost, returns into the Father. Thus life is transition. Thus the universe is change. Thus all is everything and everything is all. Sad to think that speculation, encouraged and aided by ecclesiastical falsities, should have resolved the grand biblical reality of one God into such aerial films.

"Yet to an issue so direful tends every departure from the strict monotheism of the Bible. The statement is vouched for by the history of the Church. Not content with scriptural simplicity, Greek speculators, aided by the slender forms of divinity to which they had from their cradles been used, and under the influence of which they could and did ascribe divinity to the slightest manifestation of what seemed to them divine, soon saw, in the perfections of Jesus, reason enough to give him the name of God, which they gave to so many inferior objects. The result was aided by exaggerated love and blind reverence. Then poetry came to throw its hues and images about the new divinity. By and by logic intervened, and, on its hard anvil, gave consistency and form to the divine birth. The deification of Christ potentially contained the Athanasian Trinity. The first step down the steep declivity of theological speculation was set, and thenceforward descent was unavoidable, nor could it be stopped until the bottom was reached. Yet even in the vale there was a depth so deep as to require centuries to fathom; nor has the lowest point been got to even by the Marian idolatry of the present hour; for why should not the Pope, who can place a divinity on the ecclesiastical Olympus, assume there a seat for himself?"—Pp. 55, 56.

Dr. Beard has, we think, by the publication of this earnest and timely plea for our faith, entitled himself to the respect of all who delight in a scriptural, reasonable and free religion, such as Unitarianism is.

INTELLIGENCE.

PROCEEDINGS ON LAYING THE FOUNDATION-STONE OF A UNITARIAN CHURCH IN BIRMINGHAM.

The site of the New Meeting-house, Birmingham, having become unsuitable to the members of the congregation, it was resolved to erect a new place of worship in a more convenient situation. The Committee and various members of the congregation therefore assembled, on Saturday, August 11, 1860, on the site which had been previously chosen in Broad Street, to lay the foundation-stone of the new church. The proceedings commenced with a prayer by the Rev. Charles Clarke, the minister of the Old Meeting-house.

The Chairman of the Vestry Committee, Mr. Samuel Smith, then presented to Timothy Kenrick, Esq., the Chairman of the Congregational Committee, a handsome silver trowel, bearing the following inscription, which he read to the meeting:

"Presented to Timothy Kenrick, Esq., by the Congregation of the New Meeting, on the occasion of his laying the Foundation-stone of the Church of the Messiah, Birmingham, August 11th, 1860."

Mr. Kenrick having returned thanks for this gift of the congregation, proceeded to mention that there were enclosed in the bottle which had been placed in the foundation-stone, a copy of the following newspapers of the day, viz., the "Times," the "Birmingham Journal," and "Aris' Birmingham Gazette;" also some coins of the present year, and a plan of the church and of the schools;—that the church was designed to afford accommodation of 600 sittings for the congregation and 250 sittings for the school children; and that the schools were arranged to accommodate 200 girls and 250 boys. He then proceeded to read the following copy of a document which had also been deposited in the foundation-stone:

"The Church of the Messiah. This Building, of which the Foundation-stone is this day laid, is dedicated to the worship of Almighty God, by the Congregation of Christian Worshippers now assembling in the New Meeting-house, Moor Street, Birmingham; once under the pastoral care of the illustrious Dr. Priestley, throughout the entire term of his residence in this town; and from the year 1803, for fifty years, under that of the late eminently learned and pious, the Reverend John Kentish. The present Members of this Congregation address their worship to God *the* Father alone; honouring, but not worshipping, His Son Jesus Christ, by acknowledging that through him they have access unto the Father. Desirous of maintaining inviolate the Christian liberty which they themselves enjoy, and of transmitting it unimpaired to their descendants, they leave this House of Worship free and unfettered. Avowing and exercising their own distinct profession of belief, they prescribe no form of profession whatever for others, but have faith in truth and in the God of truth, that if His Word have free course it will be glorified." Then followed the names of the Minister, Wardens and Committee.

Mr. Kenrick having laid the stone, the Rev. Samuel Bache delivered the following address:

My Christian Friends,—The document which has already been placed within the foundation-stone just laid, records, briefly but clearly, both our religious principles and our religious history. In what I have to say at this time, I shall attempt no more than to pursue the same topics into some farther detail.

We are met together here to found a house for the worship of God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth; the God and Father of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, and our God and Father. He is the God whom *alone* we find revealed both in nature and scripture, and Him *alone*, therefore, do we acknowledge and worship; in conformity with the express declaration of His anointed Prophet and beloved Son Jesus, in the very act of solemn prayer to his and our Father: "This is life eternal, that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent."* Wherefore we acknowledge and honour Jesus whom the Father hath sent, but do not worship him, as indeed the Christ. Hence the designation which we have chosen for this sacred building, "The Church of the Messiah,"—"the Church," because erected for the congregation or assembly of devout worshippers of God in the name and spirit of His Son, who, whether meeting around the family altar or in the temple which their own hands have raised, constitute a Christian church;† and "The Church of the Messiah," who is commonly called Christ,‡

* John xvii. 3.

† Compare Rom. xvi. 5, Coloss. iv. 15, and Philem. 2, with Acts xi. 26, and various similar passages.

‡ John iv. 25.

because we would hereby distinctly and gratefully own the divine authority of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ in things pertaining unto God; and avow our solemn purpose, under God's blessing, of obeying his commandments and walking in his steps.

As disciples of him who came into the world to bear witness to the truth,* we regard it as at once our duty and our privilege to prove all things, and to hold fast that which is good;† and to confess with our mouth what we believe in our hearts to be among the solemn verities of God's providence and will concerning us.‡ Applying our best intelligence seriously and honestly to the interpretation of both the works and the word of God, in the faith that He hath endowed us with reason chiefly for this high purpose, and that the fundamental principles of his government are the same throughout both the moral and spiritual universe which He hath made and ever sustains, we learn that He is God and that there is no God else beside Him;§ that Jehovah is one and His name one;‖ and hence we reject entirely every sentiment and every practice which is not strictly in accordance with these fundamental verities; and, as *Unitarian* Christians (in contradistinction from those who confessing a trinity of persons in the Godhead are therefore correctly designated *Trinitarians*)—as *Unitarian* Christians, restrict our worship to Him whom Christ especially has revealed as his and our Father, his and our God.¶

We believe that where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty;** and we therefore consecrate this house of worship to freedom as to truth: not desiring to impose our sentiments upon any; but willing to welcome all who desire to unite with us in Christian worship, and for the cultivation of the Christian life, without presuming to judge one another,†† or to judge *for* one another; knowing that every man must bear his own burden‡‡ of responsibility, and that we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.§§

We believe that faith without works is dead being alone:‖‖ that no man for saying Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of our Father who is in heaven.* We believe that it is both our obligation and our blessedness, as God gives us opportunity or enables us to discover opportunity, to do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith:† in the memorable words of our Divine Teacher, that "It is more blessed to give than to receive."‡ We believe that pure religion and undefiled before God even the Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep one's self unspotted from the world.§

We believe that charity, or universal love, is the fulfilling of the social law,‖ and the unfailing bond of perfectness;¶ and that he who loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, cannot possibly love God whom he hath not seen.** We believe that the maintenance of the truth in love,†† is the most effectual, as it is assuredly the most Christian method of keeping the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace; till we all come, in the unity of the faith and knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the full stature of Christ;‡‡—or as Jesus himself expresses the same idea under another more beautiful figure—until he himself bring us all together through our hearing (that is, obeying) his voice, so that "there shall be one fold, one shepherd."§§

Wherefore we endeavour to make the benediction of the apostle the prevailing sentiment of our hearts towards *all* our fellow-christians, whether they agree with us in doctrinal opinions or differ from us ever so widely:—"Peace be to the brethren, and love with faith, from God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ. Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity."‖‖

We believe that, in the spirit and power of his holy gospel, Christ must reign until God hath put all enemies under his feet; that the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death; that God hath put all things under his (Christ's) feet; but that when it is said, All things are put under him, it is manifest that He is excepted who did put all things under him; and that when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto Him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.¶¶

And it is our solemn purpose to cherish this belief and to strengthen it within our

---

* John xviii. 37.
‡ Romans x. 9.
‖ Zechariah xiv. 9.
** 2 Cor. iii. 17.
‡‡ Gal. vi. 5.
‖‖ James ii. 17.
† 1 Thess. v. 21.
§ Isaiah xlv. 21.
¶ John xx. 17.
†† Rom. xiv. 13.
§§ 2 Cor. v. 10.

* Matt. vii. 21.
‡ Acts xx. 35.
‖ Romans xiii. 10.
** 1 John iv. 20.
‡‡ Eph. iv. 3—13.
‖‖ Eph. vi. 23, 24.
† Gal. vi. 10.
§ James i. 27.
¶ Coloss. iii. 14.
†† Eph. iv. 15.
§§ John x. 16.
¶¶ 1 Cor. xv. 25—28.

hearts, by coming up in company with our brethren to this house of God, in order that we may here worship Him, as Christ hath taught us we must worship Him if we would worship Him acceptably, "in spirit and in truth."* This is what our pious forefathers did in their day; men whose faith and whose example it is an honour to us to follow. Ours is indeed a noble spiritual ancestry. The list of those who have ministered in holy things to this congregation from its first establishment,—to say nothing now of those who still survive, or of the private members of the congregation itself, many of whom have richly deserved an equally honourable memorial,—that list exhibits names which we can never pronounce without an admiring and grateful reverence. Bourn and Blyth, Hawkes, Edwards and Toulmin,—these are venerable names of the good departed, who, in their day of arduous service, severally approved themselves workmen that needed not to be ashamed, rightly dividing (through evil report as well as through good report)—rightly dividing the word of truth;† while the name of Priestley is now hailed by the true and generous-hearted votaries of science (speaking by the mouth of one of the most distinguished Professors of science in the venerable University of Oxford) as among the most famous of the names of the benefactors of our race, the most famous of the names of those who laid the foundations of the sciences by which the condition of humanity has been raised.‡ And this name is sacred to our memories and hearts, my brethren, for far higher services still; for free inquiry into the evidences and truths of religion, natural and revealed, and the consistent and fearless avowal of its results; for simplicity and purity of Christian doctrine; for humble, earnest, holy faith; for love unfeigned, and the very gospel spirit of forgiveness; for zealous attention to the instruction and culture of the rising race; and for the practical application of Christian principles to the daily conduct of life:—while the name of the venerable pastor and friend most recently taken from our midst,§ is still cherished among us as, like Priestley's, another name for independence and freedom, for candour and faith, for sound and accurate learning, for the critical but reverential study of God's holy word, for piety and universal love, for earnest devotion to the instruction and welfare of this Christian church, in which he laboured diligently and affectionately for a period of fifty years.

Let us emulate the devotion of these men to truth and freedom, to the best interests of our fellow-men, to the devout and reverential service of God. Let us combine, as they did, the love of God with the love of our neighbour, and be diligent and faithful, as they were, in strengthening each other's hands and cheering each other's hearts in the great work of life, and in endeavouring to train up our children in the love of God and in the practice of virtue. You have given abundant evidence, my friends, the younger among you as well as those who are advanced in life, how highly you appreciate these great ends, and how determined you are to prosecute them. May God bless you, both in your purposes and your efforts, both for your own and each other's welfare! And may this house which we have now begun to raise (if we who now lay the foundation-stone be spared to enter the completed structure) be indeed our spirit's home, sanctified by faith, by devotion and by love; so that in it God may in very deed dwell with us and we with Him! And may our children, and our children's children, through many successive generations, hither come to worship their own and their fathers' God in the beauty of holiness; until, prepared by the varied discipline of this changeful world, we take up our abode in the house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens;* and in what we shall then feel as the more immediate presence and glory of our unseen but ever-present, ever-gracious God, shall join the general assembly and church of the first-born,† and the beloved ones who are gone before us to those realms of light, meeting them to part no more for ever. May God grant it, for His infinite mercy's sake, in Christ Jesus our Lord!

The whole proceedings concluded with a prayer by Rev. S. Bache.

* John iv. 23. † 2 Tim. ii. 15.

‡ Speech of B. C. Brodie, Esq., Professor of Chemistry in the University of Oxford, reported in the Christian Reformer for August, 1860, p. 510.

§ The Rev. John Kentish, whose ministry in the New Meeting-house began Jan. 23, 1803, and ended with his life March 6, 1853.

WARWICKSHIRE UNITARIAN TRACT SOCIETY.

The fifty-fourth annual general meeting of this Society was held in the Protestant Dissenting chapel, Stourbridge, on Tuesday, Aug. 14, when the religious service was introduced by Rev. W. O. M'Gowan, of Coseley, and the sermon (which was well

* 2 Cor. v. 1. † Heb. xii. 23.

characterized in a subsequent resolution as "earnest, able and truly Christian") was preached by Rev. John Lettis Short, of Bridport, from 2 Cor. iii. 5, 6: "Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God, who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life."

At the close of the service, the chair was taken by Mr. Thomas Yate Lee, of Kinver, when the services of the various officers for the past year were duly acknowledged, appointments made for the year ensuing, and other business transacted.

About fifty members and friends of the Society, ladies as well as gentlemen, afterwards dined together, under the able presidency of J. Francis Lee, Esq., of Kinver, when the usual loyal and liberal sentiments were proposed,—the good wishes of the Society were expressed for the Rev. Dr. Davison, the Rev. Stephenson Hunter, the Rev. Thomas Hunter and the Rev. D. D. Jeremy, on occasion of their leaving this district,—and a collection was spontaneously made at the suggestion of the friends resident in Stourbridge, amounting to £7. 15*s.*, towards the liquidation of the debt of £20. 3*s.* 1*d.* due to the Treasurer. Affecting reference was made to the many changes which have taken place in the body of subscribers in general and in the Stourbridge congregation in particular, since the last meeting of the Society in that town fifteen years ago; and cheering sympathy was warmly expressed with the congregation assembling in the New Meeting-house, Birmingham, in connection with the laying the foundation-stone of their new house of worship, "the Church of the Messiah," on the previous Saturday.—The entire proceedings of the meeting were of the most harmonious and encouraging character.

MR. GANGOOLY.

This interesting young man has been making the best possible use of his time since his arrival at Liverpool. He has preached twice every Sunday, visiting in succession the following places—Liverpool, Birkenhead, Chester, Belfast, Manchester, Leeds and Bristol. He has also paid visits and taken part in week-evening services or public lectures and meetings at Dublin, Swinton, Wakefield, York, Hull, Chesterfield, Mansfield, Gloucester, Cheltenham and Evesham. Nearly the whole of his time during his intended stay in Great Britain is mapped out in successive engagements at Birmingham, in Scotland, London, the Eastern counties, &c. Liberal collections have been generally made for the Indian Mission, with which, in conjunction with Mr. Dall, he is to be connected. Our letters speak warmly of the impression Mr. Gangooly makes upon the audiences he addresses and on the persons with whom he holds intercourse. Recent communications from America tell us of some virulent attacks on Mr. Gangooly in the public press. They are anonymous and have appeared since Mr. G. left America. They have called forth some warm defences. The Rev. J. F. Clarke, the Secretary of the American Unitarian Association, writes in the *Monthly Journal*, in an article entitled "Western Tour,"—"Gangooly had bidden us farewell; and we, who had learned to love him well, had also bidden him God-speed. Men of the most opposite tendencies had joined in an affectionate leave-taking of this young man; of whom we venture to say, that no one has seen him intimately without becoming attached to him. His simplicity, purity of purpose and earnest convictions, have made him dear to many hearts."

The Editor, in an article devoted to the subject of the "Attacks on Gangooly," pronounces them "superficial" in their grounds, and says in conclusion,—

"We cannot stand by in silence, when a young man, whom we have learned to love and esteem for his candour and earnest desire to be a Christian, is coolly charged with hypocrisy and all baseness. He may turn out at last to be 'a failure;' and so may any of us turn out to be failures. We have, perhaps, been imprudent and precipitate in sympathizing with him, accepting him, and placing confidence in him; but when one comes to us, either from Andover, Oxford, New Haven or Calcutta, asking for Christian sympathy and kindness, we trust that we may always be imprudent enough to give it to him, even though he may, by possibility, hereafter prove a 'failure.'

"Those to whom Joguth was consigned by the missionary have done as well as they could by him; and, on the whole, have no reason to be dissatisfied with the result. He has been a faithful student, docile and obedient to his guardians and instructors. Those who have had the charge of him have all come to love him and believe in his sincerity. Those who have seen most of him think most highly of him. That he has faults, is probable. That some of the old heathenism is still sticking in him, is likely. But it is not by such assaults as are contained in these letters that we can help the half-converted and half-regenerate into more of purity

and of righteousness. A little more sympathy with the weak, erring and sinful, would be more Christian and more wise."

THE REV. J. C. GANGOOLY'S VISIT TO MANCHESTER.

The Unitarians of this city and neighbourhood have received a great impulse from the visit of the Rev. J. C. Gangooly. Much pardonable curiosity was manifested by great numbers to obtain a glimpse of a man whose superiority to caste prejudices and national jealousies had enabled him to break away from the fetters of a stern and unyielding philosophy, and sacrifice home and friends for the sake of the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. In a time so distinguished for its commercial rivalries and competitions as the present, when to a great extent the self-sacrificing spirit of Christianity is in bondage to the spirit of the world, it is felt to be positively refreshing to stand face to face with a man, and shake him by the hand, who has so realized the true nature of the teachings of Christ as to put into literal practice his most searching principles. Hence when Mr. Gangooly stood up in the grand old chapel in Cross Street on Sunday morning, Aug. 12, he was surrounded by a vast congregation who filled the spacious building to the very doors, many persons being compelled to stand in the aisles. For nearly an hour he spoke in simple and touching language, and succeeded in awakening a profound interest not only in himself, but in the great cause of Unitarian missions in India. In the evening of the same day, he preached to an equally large congregation in the chapel at Upper Brook Street, every available seat being occupied. Very beautifully did he refer to his own experience, and to the condition of the countless multitudes in his own country who were oppressed by the influence of dark and degrading superstitions; and there was something of genuine power and pathos in his allusion to the great work to which, under God's blessing, he was now about to devote his life. At the close of his address, many of the warm-hearted friends of Unitarian Christianity gathered around him, eager to shew their sympathy with him and their hearty admiration for his unflinching courage and unflagging zeal. He could not but be encouraged and strengthened when he felt the strong and honest grasp of loving hands, and heard the genuine words of Christian gentleness and love.

On Monday evening, the 13th, a large and splendid gathering of ministers and friends took place in the school-room, and afterwards, by adjournment, in the chapel of Dr. Beard, to give a welcome to the distinguished visitor. Among the ministers who were present we observed the Revds. J. R. Beard, D.D., G. H. Wells, M.A., H. Green, M.A., J. Gordon, C. C. Nutter, J. Drummond, B.A., J. C. Street, E. Smith, M.A., G. Hoade, R. W. Hopkinson, T. E. Poynting, M. Gibson, W. Whitelegge, J. J. Bishop, B.A., J. Freeston, J. Cropper, M.A., &c., with a number of the students of the Home Missionary Board and several students of the Manchester New College. After partaking of tea in the school-room, the meeting took place in the chapel. When a hymn had been sung, the Rev. Dr. Beard, who was in the chair, in a few introductory words, in which he spoke of Rammohun Roy and William Roberts, gave a personal greeting and welcome to Mr. Gangooly, and then called upon the Rev. J. Gordon to move a resolution of welcome on behalf of the meeting. In appropriate terms Mr. Gordon discharged his pleasing duty, and Mr. B. Heape, of Polefield, seconded the resolution. When Mr. Gangooly rose to address the meeting, he was received with hearty plaudits, long sustained. For upwards of an hour he riveted the attention of his audience by an interesting narrative, containing personal experiences, historical circumstances, graphic illustrations drawn from natural phenomena, and the state of opinion and prejudices among his countrymen; he corrected popular errors held by Englishmen with regard to the nature of the worship offered to Juggernaut, and dispelled the notion that Hindoos were habituated to throw themselves under the colossal car of this deity; he also pictured the condition of society among the Brahmins, and spoke especially of the hardships and restraints experienced by their women, and urged the necessity of sending out earnest female missionaries; and concluded his interesting speech, which was full of anecdote and humour, by telling of his determination to devote himself faithfully to the great work of preaching the gospel among his brethren. Remarks were then offered by the Revds. Henry Green and J. Drummond, and Professor Buckland, of Toronto, formerly the Domestic Missionary in Manchester, and then the interesting meeting was concluded by singing and prayer.

On Tuesday evening, Mr. Gangooly preached to a crowded congregation in the chapel at Swinton, where a hearty welcome was accorded to him by the zealous friends of Unitarian Christianity connected with that place.

We believe that liberal responses have been made to the appeal for funds, and

are quite sure that Mr. G.'s visit will be remembered with grateful feelings for many years to come. J. C. S.

UNITARIAN QUAKERS IN MANCHESTER.

No little excitement has been felt among certain classes of the citizens of Manchester by a recent visit of Dr. J. W. Moore and Rachel Moore, his wife, from Philadelphia, U.S., the latter an approved minister of the Society of Friends. Most of our readers will remember the division which took place among the *Friends* in America on matters of Christian doctrine, which separated them into two distinct societies, the smaller of which was Trinitarian, and the larger and more influential being Unitarian. Dr. Moore and his wife are members of this latter body, and represent the opinions of upwards of seventy thousand Friends. Mrs. Moore, a lady of considerable culture and great refinement of manners, being deeply impressed with the idea that she must go forth and preach the gospel of the grace of God, has, in company with her husband, travelled in various parts of Great Britain, and preached wherever a favourable opportunity occurred. In every place, however, the English Quakers have issued protests against them, declaring that they are not members of any society recognized *by them* as belonging to the church of Christ, and in various other ways have striven to impede their efforts. It is greatly to be deplored that the Society of Friends in England, so distinguished as it is for wide and judicious benevolence and for prominence in all works of Christian philanthropy, should thus connect itself with a system of short-sighted exclusiveness and intolerant bigotry. If anywhere, we should certainly have expected among the English Quakers a large-hearted Christian charity which thinketh no evil. But we appear to be greatly mistaken. When Dr. and Mrs. Moore arrived in Manchester, no place was open to them wherein they might speak of the gospel of Christ. Fortunately they were directed to Dr. Beard, who, with the concurrence of his chapel committee, at once placed the Bridge-Street chapel at their disposal for a religious service. When their announcement of service was made, a disclaimer was advertised by the Manchester Quakers; they were evidently in a hurry to avoid anything like the supposition of heresy as applied to them. This disclaimer did not, however, prevent a large congregation assembling on Friday evening, Aug. 10, to hear what the new comers had to proclaim. The service was conducted in the way which is universally customary among the Friends. Mrs. Moore then proceeded to give a full and clear account of the doctrines held by the denomination to which she belonged, taking occasion to argue with great force against the common doctrines of the Trinity, Atonement and Original Sin, and contending earnestly for views which are almost identical with those held by Unitarian Christians. During her address she maintained that the views she was explaining were those held by George Fox. Here she was interrupted by some over-zealous and not good-mannered *friend*, who called out, "*It is not true.*" Mrs. Moore proceeded quietly with her address, and presently quoted the very words of George Fox which proved that her statements were perfectly correct. She was not again interrupted, but concluded her deeply interesting statement amid the profound silence of her audience. When the people were leaving the chapel, printed documents were put into their hands by some of the Manchester Quakers.

On the evening of Sunday, Aug. 12, the Unitarian chapel at Swinton was placed at the disposal of Dr. and Mrs. Moore for a religious service. The chapel was well filled with an intelligent and appreciating audience. The address of Mrs. Moore was very striking and effective, and revealed a singular agreement between the doctrines of the Friends and those of Unitarians. Our Unitarian friends were exceedingly gratified with what they heard. Dr. and Mrs. Moore expressed the great satisfaction they had felt at the generous treatment they had experienced at the hands of the Unitarians of Manchester, and at the friendly greetings they had received from the Revds. J. R. Beard, D.D., J. C. Street and C. C. Nutter, and Mr. J. Armstrong. Their mission is a thoroughly disinterested one; they are travelling entirely at their own expense, and paying for all rooms, printing, advertising, &c. We know that offers of pecuniary assistance have more than once been made, and have been firmly but gracefully declined. We trust that wherever they go they will receive kind and courteous treatment at the hands of Unitarians. We cannot but once more express our surprise and regret that the English Friends should imitate the conduct of many Trinitarian controversialists, and offer an opposition so little in harmony with the gentle graces of Christianity and their own professions of brotherly love.

UNITARIAN CHAPEL, BLACKLEY, NEAR MANCHESTER.

In this small but growing village there has been a Unitarian chapel since 1697,

which has never been largely attended, but for a long time past, until the beginning of the present year, its worshipers have numbered between 20 and 30 only. These have formed its regular congregation, who have ordinarily met once only on the Sabbath, the pulpit being supplied by students of the Home Missionary College. Very few strangers from the neighbourhood ever entered its walls. Unitarianism they had been taught to dread, though they did not understand it. About four months ago, the Rev. J. C. Street, superintendent missionary of the Manchester district, took it under his charge, with the intention of working up a congregation out of its neighbourhood. The results up to the present time are most gratifying. A course of lectures was delivered in the evenings, which drew together upwards of 130 hearers, very few of whom had ever been in a Unitarian place of worship before the commencement of those lectures. A school was formed and a good staff of teachers at once obtained, and notwithstanding the greatest opposition shewn by the orthodox bodies in the pulpits and in the homes of the people, the number of scholars has steadily and constantly increased.

At the opening of the school, 20 scholars were present, and last Sunday (the seventh from its commencement) 60 scholars and a corresponding number of teachers were present. A young women's Bible class has also been established, conducted by the Rev. J. C. Street, every Tuesday evening, at which 14 adult scholars attend. Seeing that a warm interest was excited in the neighbourhood, the opportunity which a holiday afforded was seized upon, and a tea-party was announced. The school-room (a room in the Mechanics' Institution) not being at liberty, the tea was served in chapel. On Monday, Aug. 6th, at five o'clock, more than a hundred persons sat down to drink tea off tables placed in the pews for that purpose. The usual verses were sung, and the tea passed very satisfactorily.

After a short interval, during which the tables were cleared and everything set in order, E. Brookes, Esq., took the chair. After a voluntary on the organ, a hymn was sung, and the Rev. C. C. Nutter (who is at present assisting the Rev. J. C. Street) spoke on "The Unitarian Missions at Home and Abroad," followed by J. Bennett, Esq., on "The Blackley Sunday-school." A hymn was then sung, when all adjourned into the chapel-yard to watch the ascent of a small balloon which was prepared to please the younger portion of the meeting. Another hymn was sung, and Mr. William Oates, student of the Home Missionary College, spoke on "The Blackley Unitarian Chapel," followed by the Rev. E. W. Hopkinson on "Missions to the Poor." Mr. Noah Green, of the Home Missionary College, spoke on the "Household of Faith;" and the Rev. J. C. Street very appropriately ended the speaking in a very able manner by an address on the "Manchester District Unitarian Association." A vote of thanks to the Chairman was then passed for the efficient manner in which he had filled his office; and E. Wadsworth, Esq., also received the thanks of the meeting for his very skilful and acceptable services on the organ. The meeting separated about half-past nine, having concluded with a hymn and prayer; and many smiling faces told that it had given great satisfaction.

With such instances as this before us, we have good reason to discontinue the use of such phrases as, "Unitarianism is a tree of slow growth"—"Unitarianism appeals to the head more than to the heart, and therefore is embraced only by cold, logical, calculating natures." This and many other similar instances prove the fallacy of both these sayings. Here at least the doctrines of Unitarianism have approved themselves to the hearts and minds of those who had attended the Wesleyan chapel and the church, also of many who did not usually attend any place of worship. It has not grown slowly here, but very rapidly, and under good care, as it is and has been, continued success is sure. Already the room in the Mechanics' Institution, which for a Sunday-school was thought large enough at any rate for twelve months, is found to be too small. There is a great improvement in the attendance at both services in the chapel. The future which is opening out for the Blackley Unitarian chapel is a very auspicious one, and highly gratifying to those who are working for and who feel interested in its welfare.

W. O.

KENT AND SUSSEX UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION.

The forty-eighth anniversary was held in the General Baptist chapel, Hamond Hill, Chatham, on Wednesday, July 25th. The Rev. W. H. Quinn, the minister of the congregation, introduced the services; and the Rev. J. Panton Ham, of Essex-Street chapel, London, delivered an excellent and appropriate discourse. At two p.m., the members and friends of the Association, to the number of between 90 and 100, dined together at the Crown Hotel, Rochester, under the able presidency of Sir John Bowring, supported by John

Tribe, Esq., as Vice-chairman. The usual sentiments were proposed and duly honoured:—"The Queen;" "The rest of the Royal Family;" "The Kent and Sussex Unitarian Christian Association," in reply to which the annual report was read by the Secretary, the Rev. R. E. B. Maclellan, of Maidstone; "Civil and Religious Liberty all the World over," responded to by the Rev. Wm. Smith, of Canterbury; "The Rev. J. Panton Ham, and thanks for his discourse," which that gentleman suitably acknowledged; "Health and long life to Sir John Bowring," proposed by the Vice-chairman; the "Fourth Estate of the Realm," spoken to by the editor of one of the local papers; "The Mayor, Corporation and Magistrates of the city of Rochester," which called up Mr. Tribe on the part of the Corporation, and Mr. Steele, a liberal Churchman present, on the part of the Magistracy; "The glorious Two Thousand," which drew forth an eloquent address from John Brent, Esq., Jun., F.S.A., of Canterbury. After less than an hour's intermission, the same party, slightly increased, assembled to tea, Sir John Bowring still presiding; when stirring speeches were made by the Rev. J. O. Squier, of Headcorn, on "Our Pious Forefathers;" the Rev. W. H. Quinn, on "The Duty of bearing witness to the Truth;" and the Rev. R. E. B. Maclellan, on "The Coming Age."

This was the most successful meeting that has been held in Kent for many years; and much of its interest and value are owing to the observations made by the Chairman in proposing the different sentiments, abounding as those remarks did in the results both of study and of travel. It was noted with hopefulness, that of the five ministers present on the occasion, not less than four, namely, Messrs. Ham, Maclellan, Squier and Quinn, had been brought up even to man's estate as Trinitarians and Calvinists. Twenty-five years had elapsed since this anniversary was last held in Chatham; but so great were the pleasure and profit experienced from this reunion, that the friends present from London, Maidstone, Tenterden, Canterbury and Dover, look forward to many similar meetings in the same locality.

LIST OF PREACHERS AND THEIR SUBJECTS AT CLEATOR.

1860. July 29, Rev. J. R. Beard, D.D., Manchester—Morning: The Members of a Household (Matt. xii. 46). Afternoon: Worldly Prosperity—whence does it come? The Secularistic View and the Christian (Prov. x. 22).

Aug. 26, Rev. T. E. Poynting, Monton—Morning: Christ the Physician of Souls (Mark ii. 17). Afternoon: Christ the highest Manifestation of Spiritual Life (1 John i. 2).

Sept. 30, Rev. Franklin Baker, M.A., Bolton-le-Moors—Morning: God always around our Path and about our Ways (Gen. iii. 9). Afternoon: The Dispute between Paul and Peter at Antioch (Gal. ii. 11—14).

Oct. 28, Rev. John Wright, B.A., Bury—Morning: Divine Influence and Human Free-will (Romans viii. 26, Phil. ii. 12). Afternoon: Every Employment may be a Religious Ministry (Luke viii. 39).

Nov. 25, Rev. Andrew Creery, M.A., Stockport—Morning: The Joys of a True Faith (Phil. iv. 4). Afternoon: Man's Need of God (Exod. iii. part of 12).

Dec. 30, Rev. S. A. Steinthal, Liverpool—Morning: Certainty and Change (Luke xxi. 33)—Sacrament—Afternoon: The Joy of Religion (Phil. iv. 4).

1861. Jan. 27, Rev. Henry Green, M.A., Knutsford—Morning: Prayer the Remedy for Anxiousness of Heart (Phil. iv. 6, 7). Afternoon: Religion the Agent that develops and raises Human Nature (Eph. iv. 11—13).

Feb. 24, Rev. W. H. Herford, Lancaster—Morning: Christ crucified, the Power of God, and the Wisdom of God (1 Cor. i. 23, 24). Afternoon: Our Aids against Temptation (Romans viii. 26).

March 31, Rev. G. H. Wells, M.A., Gorton—Morning: The Connection between Christianity and the Social Affections (John xix. 26, 27). Afternoon: Public Worship (Psalm xxvi. 8).

April 28, Rev. J. T. Whitehead, Ainsworth—Morning: Moral Blindness (John iii. 19). Afternoon: Religion and the World (John xvii. 15).

May 26, Rev. John Gordon, Dukinfield—Morning: The Draught of Fishes (John xxi. 6). Afternoon: The Good Centurion (Matt. viii. 5—13).

June 30, Rev. William Gaskell, M.A., Manchester—Morning: Christians ought to excel Others (Matt. v. 47). Afternoon: Christian Views of Human Nature (Romans ii. 14).

Morning service at 10.45. Afternoon service at 3 o'clock.

CONVERTS TO AND FROM UNITARIANISM.

The last report of the Unitarian Association of America contains a reference to certain theological changes, the balance of which was largely in favour of the Unitarian church,—the principal loss being that of Professor Huntington, whose opinions

had long been indefinite and open to suspicion,—and the gains including Messrs. Baldwin, Ames, Town, Calthorp, Miller, &c. In England, two gentlemen have just retired from the church with which they have been hitherto associated; and here we have to speak of a loss and a gain. Rev. H. V. Palmer, formerly assistant to the late Rev. Charles Wellbeloved, has received ordination as a curate from the Archbishop of York. On the cessation of his engagement at York, after some ineffectual efforts to settle with an Unitarian congregation at Wakefield, Rochdale, &c., and after preaching in the pulpit of his friend, the late Rev. G. Harris, he suddenly dissociated himself from his Unitarian friends, and made overtures to the authorities at York to be admitted into the bosom and ministry of the Church of England. Mr. Palmer is an amiable man, and will, we dare say, if he obtains preferment, make a useful parochial clergyman, but neither in regard to talent or learning (for he had not the advantage of a professional education) is his secession of any importance. On the other side of the denominational account we now have to name the public adoption of Unitarian opinions by the Rev. John Thomas, B.A., of St. John's College, Cambridge, till within a few weeks curate of Earsdon, in the county of Northumberland, and previously and for two years curate at St. George's, in Manchester. Mr. Thomas has preached, and with great acceptance, in the Unitarian pulpits at Kentish Town and Hackney, and has left a very favourable impression of his piety and his professional ability on the minds of the ministers of those two congregations. Mr. Thomas is, we believe, prepared to enter, whenever the opportunity is given him, on the stated ministry amongst the Unitarians. As in America, so in England, the balance in these theological changes is of a kind to give us perfect satisfaction.

CIRENCESTER.

The ancient Presbyterian chapel in this town, which has for some time been closed, was opened for public worship on Sunday, Aug. 19, by Rev. Samuel Martin, of Trowbridge. About thirty persons attended the morning service, and in the evening the chapel was pretty well filled. The excellent services of Mr. Martin were listened to with deep interest. At the close of the evening service, Mr. Martin requested the congregation to remain, and he addressed them in explanation of the present state of the chapel, and the wish of the trustees to re-organize public worship. He also took the opportunity of distributing tracts, which were eagerly received by the people. Several persons assured him that if a respectable Unitarian minister were stationed in Cirencester, a fair congregation would soon be gathered. But forty years of neglect have left the place in a most dilapidated condition, and before anything can be done in the way of collecting a congregation, it will be necessary to repair the chapel and to make preparations for heating and lighting the building. These matters, we are glad to know, are receiving the attention of Rev. William James, of Bristol, and the Committee of the Western Union, and we have no doubt that means will be taken to effect whatever is necessary.

THEOLOGY IN OUR COURTS OF LAW.

However admirable our courts of law may be in sifting facts, we cannot praise them as places for the elucidation of opinions in theology. There is so much that is vague and undefined in the phraseology of religious polemics, that on the meaning of some particular word, of no small importance perhaps to a just decision in the case, the Judge may have a very different impression from that entertained by the counsel on one side or the other, and the jury may scarcely have a conviction or a feeling in common with the witnesses. Again, prejudice has so large a domain in all theological discussions, and persons untrained in logic so frequently confound together a doctrine and *their own conclusions respecting it*, that, with equal honesty of intention, two men hearing the same evidence shall reach conclusions in direct opposition. On these accounts we commonly feel some regret when theological opinions which we believe to be true and important become the themes of counsel learned in the law, and are disserted upon in a Judge's charge, and have to be decided on by that unreliable intellectual apparatus, an English jury. At the recent assizes for South Lancashire, a case occurred in which there was throughout a great deal of theological arguing, and the result of which was, we imagine, unsatisfactory to all concerned. An Unitarian schoolmaster of Todmorden, named Harrison, claimed damages from a grocer of the same town for a libel, in which he was charged with teaching his pupils that the Bible was full of lies. The defendant attempted, but wholly failed, to justify the libel. The presiding Judge, Mr. Baron Wilde, held the scales of justice with a firm and even hand, and the jury, under his guidance, found a verdict for the plantiff, but nulli-

fied the verdict by assessing the damages on the amount of the smallest coin of the land. Some portion of the Judge's charge, as reported in an "orthodox" version of the trial now before us, is worthy of being preserved:

"A very great deal had been said about the plaintiff putting new constructions on passages of Scripture; but it was one thing to attach a meaning different to that generally received to a particular word or two, and another to say that the Bible contained lies. Mankind had largely and widely at all times disputed upon certain words, but the very men who had so disputed—the men who had most ardently entered into controversy—were generally precisely the most conscientious men, having the greatest possible respect for the Bible itself; and to say of a man when he put a different construction upon a certain passage, that he was saying the Bible was full of lies, was to put into his mouth an expression of irreverence towards the Bible which was the last of his objects to create or to say. On the question of damages, he advised the jury, if they found for the plaintiff, to give such damages as would vindicate his character. He hoped the jury would not allow themselves to be launched into the theological controversy, or to take any strong position with either one party or the other. It was a misfortune that the controversy had arisen in the way it had done. It was much better that gentlemen should confine themselves to lecturing, and not invite a public discussion upon matters which were intricate beyond all measure, and which had puzzled—and probably would continue to puzzle—the wisest, the most learned and the most ingenious of mankind, ever since the time when the sacred volume was written."

The angry controversy at Todmorden originated in a lecture of an itinerating gentleman of considerable notoriety, named Brindley. One object we have in noticing this matter at all is to counsel our Unitarian friends to take no notice of this person's attacks on their opinions. He is, we are informed, an ignorant man and a very unscrupulous partizan. A considerable portion of his stock in trade consists in abuse of Unitarians, and if he can succeed in provoking them into personal controversy, he has a profitable vent for his common plans of malediction. Leave such men to their own devices, and they soon cease to attract notice. As the result of a not short observation, we think that even orthodox and apparently consenting audiences really place little confidence in the denunciations uttered by popular orators. The Liverpool jury were, after all, not so very wrong in assigning a minimum of mischief to the libel of which they found the defendant guilty. He might intend, but he could not inflict, a serious damage on the character of his Unitarian neighbour. The most painful part of the case at Liverpool was the way in which young persons, and even children, were brought into court to justify the libel by very hard swearing, the effect of which in nearly every case was broken down by the cross-examination of the plantiff's counsel. "The Bible was full of lies," was only an orthodox version of an opinion uttered by the plaintiff respecting the true meaning of a scripture phrase. The grocer of Todmorden and his friend Brindley disliked and disagreed with the interpretation proposed by the schoolmaster, and hence the libel and the evidence by which it was attempted to be justified. —It is far from our intention to recommend silence to Unitarians when attacked and misrepresented. Only let them be prudent in their choice of times and modes of defence. Sermons, lectures, tracts, the public press, all are available to those unjustly assailed; but from personal discussions, and from arguments in a court of law on theology, we expect little good to result.

THE HINDOO MISSION.

We take from the "Monthly Journal of the American Unitarian Association" for August, just received, some interesting extracts from the letters of Mr. Dall.

"Calcutta, May 3, 1860.

"As to the North (or strictly North-*west*, a thousand or twelve hundred miles), a spirit of inquiry is certainly awakening there.

"Capt. Mercer, the originator of the N.W. Unitarian Christian Association, has been boarding at the same house with me here in Calcutta for the last six or seven weeks; and I may say, that *his* view of our mission, duty, and our wonderfully rich opportunity of gospellizing India, is nearly identical with your own, as expressed in your last cheering letter to me. He is an incessant labourer himself, and almost literally talks with every man he meets on the subjects of Unitarian truth. He walks late and early, and takes the hand of every man likely to be accessible to his message. He laments every day that Unitarians (N.B.—He was *nurtured* in the Church of England) do not more magnify their calling, and take a positive, and even *aggressive*, position, such as is theirs of right. Would that they might do so, and so move on to victory! The time is ripe for it, especially in India.

During this short stay in Calcutta, Capt. E. S. Mercer has printed several pamphlets and tracts (up to three thousand copies) of his own preparation, and wholly at his own charge. He is also about taking on himself the risk of a journey to England, and taking with him his excellent converts, Abdool Musih and wife,—hoping that our English fellow-believers will shew the same interest in Abdool that his American ones have in Joguth Chunder Gangooly.

"I have letters, quite lately received, from newly stirred inquirers in the North-west, men whom Capt. Mercer and Abdool chanced to meet on their way down to Calcutta from Peshawur; and so far interested that they have promptly sent down for books and tracts, which I have as promptly posted for them, with letters.

"These North-westerns write in the Perso-Arabic cipher, and I enclose one letter for your inspection. Capt. Mercer is a good Persian scholar, and has translated them for me.

"I have received another, in Oordoo, from Jullunder. I have also the addresses of several good men, Asiatics, who wish to be in correspondence with us at other cities in the Far North-west.

"Capt. Mercer feels almost as if the whole country was ripe for us. He may be over-hopeful; but he believes that a magnificent and gigantic change in religious matters is impending over this age and country; and blessed the man who is on the spot to greet and guide it!

"To turn now to Madras. I have just received a letter from Mr. G. A. Regel, himself a school teacher, and residing quite near the Roberts' chapel, and the only white man who at the present time attends there. At his request, I have sent him to-day forty additional 'Sunday-School Gazettes,' and a copy of the selected volume of Channing. He says,—and I have no ground whatever for a suspicion of interested motives,—

"'I sincerely wish to devote my leisure moments, if possible, to mission duties, in assisting Brother Roberts till a European missionary is sent out from home. I trust you will have no objections. If this proposal of mine suits your good-will, I think it will be of much good. The schools, if placed under my care, will be on a better footing; as Brother Roberts has too much to do and cannot devote much time to them. I visited the school in Porasawalkum: thirty lads on the register; present, twenty-one boys and three girls. These were examined before me. Want of books is their teacher's complaint. I also examined the school in Royapettah, in Brother Roberts's premises; and the lads there are better taught. I have not called to see the other school in that locality. A European must be at the head of these schools, otherwise they will not flourish. There is no system of teaching, neither any order observed. The teachers' complaint is, that they are not (as others) remunerated monthly; and how can they work? The whole truth is this—they are not afraid of Brother Roberts, as he is too mild with them.—The chapel sadly requires repairs; and divine service, either in Tamul or English, must be held every Lord's-day, morning and evening, as well as on a week-day evening. I would not care to undertake the English service. The scanty attendance must not be minded. 'Where two or three are gathered together,' you know. I wish the Unitarians every good, and therefore I seek their spiritual welfare. Sunday last being Easter-day, the Lord's Supper was celebrated at the Unitarian chapel: there were upwards of fifty communicants. Brother Roberts is very poor and down-hearted, and needs help.'"

ILKESTON, DERBYSHIRE.

The old Unitarian chapel at this place, which has been partially closed for some years, has been re-opened within the last twelve months under the auspices of the North-Midland Unitarian Village Mission Society. Great inconvenience having been experienced hitherto by the Rev. T. R. Elliott in conducting the devotional part of the service, through the want of a regular choir, a few friends at Nottingham have kindly provided a harmonium, which was opened on Sunday, August 19th. A sermon on the occasion was preached by the Rev. P. W. Clayden, of Nottingham, and Mr. Henry Farmer presided at the harmonium. The chapel was excessively crowded. The old chapel is in a very dilapidated and repulsive condition, and some friends from Nottingham who were present were much impressed with the necessity of rebuilding it before any permanent revival of the cause can be expected to result from the labours of any minister, however zealous.

OBITUARY.

April 10, at Ringwood, ELIZABETH, widow of the late John CONWAY, Esq., aged 87.

When real excellence and worth, as exhibited in the life of those who have long shewn a devoted and consistent attachment to the leading doctrines of the Unitarian faith, are removed from sight, we claim the privilege of recording a few of those traits of character by which the departed were distinguished, and by which they endeared themselves to those who lived within the circle of their influence. The deceased was the last but one of her own generation of an old and respectable family of Protestant Dissenters, steadily attached to and consistently holding to the profession of the principles of Christian liberty and religious truth. Her descendants and connections will cherish her memory, both on account of her many virtues and from the uniform kindness which she shewed towards them. We may be allowed to give a few extracts from her funeral sermon, in which some of her many excellent qualities are briefly recorded.

"My fellow-christians, we are called upon on this occasion to pay a tribute to the memory of departed worth. May we be stimulated to walk in her steps and to imitate her example!

"Those who had the satisfaction of knowing intimately the late Mrs. Conway can best bear witness to her numerous good qualities, and can most justly appreciate her character and estimate its worth. It is but fair to state that the religious sentiments and principles which she had formed, while they proved the source of consolation in the days of her happiness and in those of her trials, were at the same time the source whence flowed the many virtues by which her long and useful life was distinguished. They led her to view God as her Heavenly Father, ever desirous of confiding in his goodness and mercy, and deriving consolation and peace from the hopes and promises of the gospel. * * Placed by Providence in a position of life which allowed her to exercise in a more practical manner the kind and benevolent affections and to indulge in the luxury of doing good, she did not forget her responsibility in this respect, and many there are who have reason to cherish a grateful remembrance of her kindness and generosity. Yet was her benevolence singularly free from every approach towards parade and ostentation: to this she had a marked dislike. * * In her home she was distinguished for her generous but unostentatious hospitality and for her courteous attention. * * She was a firm believer in the doctrine of the strict and simple unity of God; but her attachment to this great and fundamental truth of all religion was unaccompanied with any narrow or exclusive feelings. The essence of real religion she believed to consist in the possession of a spirit and temper in accordance with the life of the Saviour; and never for a moment did she waver in this pleasing and delightful conviction at which she had arrived. Her religion, therefore, was of a truly practical kind. Having the most enlarged conceptions of the goodness of our Heavenly Father, it was her firm and consistent belief that the good of all sects, of every tribe and kindred, will hereafter partake of the blessings of the Redeemer's kingdom, and be admitted to share in its glories.

"In the exercise of her social and religious duties, and in the public services and ordinances of religion in this place, till growing infirmities confined her to her home, she regularly, consistently and earnestly engaged, and, as you well know, ever took a most lively interest in all proceedings connected with the welfare and prosperity of this congregation. * * She calmly and without a struggle closed a life full of years and usefulness, leaving to all an example of real Christian piety and worth, and to those who knew her more intimately, and especially to those of her own household, a persuasive lesson to copy her many excellences and virtues.

"And to my fellow-christians, especially to those who are not in the habit of worshiping in this place, I may be permitted to say, if to hold a faith that is unencumbered by any inexplicable, degrading or superstitious views of the nature and attributes of Him who is the sole Ruler of the universe and the benevolent Disposer of all events,—if to believe that it is to this ONE gracious and merciful Parent of all that the most reverential feeling and pious regards of the devout soul should at all times be directed,—if to hold that a humble and cheerful acquiescence in the will of Him to whom we justly ascribe every excellence and perfection, is our highest duty and our noblest praise,—if to regard His complacency and delight in those who strive to assimilate their character to that of the Great Founder of our religion, as our best possession and our highest privilege on earth,—if this be

a true estimate of real, genuine, heartfelt religion, then was her life, guided and directed by its sacred influence, a practical proof of the worth of those views that were her best support under trials which she was not unfrequently called upon to bear, both in her own person and in the removal of those who were attached to her by the tenderest family ties. The calmness and fortitude with which she sustained her growing infirmities, and the happy complacency of spirit with which she looked forward to and met her end, are the best comment on her religious faith and convictions that could be given, and they afford the most striking evidence of the benign and happy influence on the mind of the great and holy principles of the gospel in those moments of life when the comforts and consolations of religion are most needed."

Her remains were interred in the family vault in the chapel-yard at Ringwood on Monday, April 16th, by Rev. M. Rowntree, Poole, who also preached on the following Sunday her funeral sermon, which was listened to with a marked and mournful attention by the congregation present, many appearing from other religious societies in the town, desirous by these means of expressing their respect for the memory of the departed and their sympathy with survivors. R.

June 19, aged 68, FRANCIS AYLMER FROST, Esq., of Queen's Park, Chester. This excellent man was descended from one of not the least eminent of the ejected clergy of 1662,—John Meadows, Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge, and Rector of Ousden, in Suffolk. Mr. Frost was through life a quiet but firm supporter of the principles of civil and religious liberty and of Unitarian Nonconformity. In Chester, where he was long and universally known (one of his sons having recently filled the office of Mayor of that ancient city), he was highly respected. The recollection of his unobtrusive virtues is cherished by a large circle of relatives and friends.

June 26, at Gerrards, Gee Cross, Cheshire, Mrs. BETTY OLDHAM, aged 102 years and six months. She lived much respected by her neighbours and her numerous relatives of the families of Ashtons and Oldhams, and her attaining her hundredth year was celebrated by a social party at the house of her great-nephew, Benjamin Ashton, Esq., of Pole Bank. Her remains were interred in the ground of Hyde chapel, and a very beautiful and impressive sermon was preached on the Sunday following her interment by her minister, the Rev. Charles Beard.

July 1, at the house of her son-in-law, S. Roberts, Esq., Witham Bank, Boston, Lincolnshire, aged 70 years, ANN, widow of the late Rev. Richard ASTLEY, formerly of Halifax, Gloucester and Shrewsbury. She was a lineal descendant of Oliver Heywood, the eminent Puritan and Nonconformist divine.

Aug. 5, at Reading, after a long illness, ISABELLA, wife of Rev. H. E. HOWSE, aged 52. Her "record is on high."

MARRIAGES.

July 7, at Lewin's-Mead chapel, Bristol, by Rev. Wm. James, Mr. JOHN PARNALL, of College Green, to MARY, only daughter of Mr. James Verry STAPLES, of Stokes Croft, Bristol.

Aug. 6, at the Unitarian chapel, Plymouth, by Rev. Henry Knott, Mr. JAMES WILLIAM WATERS to EMMA JANE, daughter of Mr. William MACEY, both of Plymouth.

Aug. 7, at the chapel, Little Portland Street, by Rev. Thomas Madge, THOMAS PIX COBB, Esq., of Gloucester Place, Hyde Park, second son of T. R. Cobb, Esq., of Banbury, to CLARA ANNE, daughter of John WATSON, Esq., of Leinster Gardens.

Aug. 15, at the Ancient chapel, Toxteth Park, Liverpool, by Rev. John Hamilton Thom, HENRY RUSSELL, son of Robert Hyde GREG, Esq., to EMILY, daughter of the late S. S. GAIR, Esq., of Liverpool.

Aug. 19, at the Unitarian chapel, Plymouth, by Rev. Henry Knott, Mr. HENRY GARLAND to MARY, daughter of Mr. Thos. JOHNSON.

THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CXC.] OCTOBER, 1860. [Vol. XVI.

ESSAYS AND REVIEWS—THE BROAD CHURCH.*

It is amusing to one who sits calmly enjoying free thought and its rich and varied consequences on the outside of the popular religious communities, to see how every now and then those communities are thrown into alarm and confusion by the appearance of some truth-loving preacher or some free-speaking book. The disturbance resembles a storm suddenly raised on the Lake of Galilee by conflicting winds hurled down one of its narrow and precipitous ravines. An effect of the kind has been produced by the volume we now design to introduce to our readers. The orthodox periodical press has teemed with reprobatory reviews. Cries of "Heresy! heresy!" echo and re-echo on all sides. Criticism is blinded by passion, and the traditions of the schools have it all their own way. The general voice is, that this is a bad book, a dangerous book; yet somehow the book is read. Perhaps the book is read because it is abused; perhaps it is read also because some portion of the public mind is prepared for the book. Any way, the book came to a second edition shortly after it appeared, and so is worthy of a somewhat special notice, if only as disclosing one of the signs of the times. Certainly the book is anything but orthodox, and its reception goes some way to shew that as orthodoxy is not alone in authority at Oxford, the birthplace of the volume, so is it somewhat at a discount and not a little afraid, at least in literary and cultured circles of our larger religious bodies. Indeed, the work is a decisive proof of the progress made by free thought, sound scholarship and liberal opinion, in matters theological. So far as the intellectual tendencies of the volume are concerned, we can, with one or two exceptions, rejoice at its appearance. Would that we could say the same as to its moral aspects! The writers are men of high culture and exact scholarship. Having themselves shared in the rich harvest of religious thought produced and garnered by the great scholars and theologians of Germany, they come forward to communicate their advantages to the churches in which the English language is spoken. Especially do they address themselves to the more cultivated members of those churches. The

* Essays and Reviews. Second Edition. London—John W. Parker and Son, West Strand.

topics on which they write, lying as they do at the foundations of theological science, ask for an intelligent and to some extent a specially prepared auditory. While, however, the topics are abstract, profound and grave, they are here treated in a popular and interesting manner, so as to make the subject-matter accessible to every thoughtful person, and to offer a plentiful reward to the careful student. The contents comprise seven essays, thrown together into a volume apparently at random, yet by no means without a unity of effect; for they all bear on questions of great moment, questions on which advancing knowledge has occasioned great changes, if not revolutions, and to which the minds of many of the leaders of theological opinion have their eyes turned with no small interest, if not concern. The first essay, by Dr. Temple, Head Master of Rugby School, treats of "The Education of the World," endeavouring to trace an analogy between the successive steps of Divine Providence in the religious discipline of the human family and the successive ages through which individuals of that family pass in their journey from the cradle to the grave. In the second essay, entitled "Bunsen's Biblical Researches," Dr. Rowland Williams, Vice-Principal of the Episcopal College at Lampeter, in Wales, undertakes to give a summary of the conclusions to which Chevalier Bunsen has arrived in his learned, laborious and very diversified studies relating to biblical chronology, history, antiquities, &c. A passage in this instructive piece so well illustrates the predominating spirit, and what we may perhaps denominate the aim, of this book, that we extract it, though rather long.

"This recognition of Christ as the moral Saviour of mankind may seem to some Baron Bunsen's most obvious claim to the name of Christian. For, though he embraces with more than orthodox warmth New Testament terms, he explains them in such a way, that he may be charged with using Evangelical language in a philosophical sense. But in reply he would ask, what proof is there that the reasonable sense of St. Paul's words was not the one which the Apostle intended? Why may not justification by faith have meant the peace of mind, or sense of Divine approval, which comes of trust in a righteous God, rather than a fiction of merit by transfer? St. Paul would then be teaching moral responsibility, as opposed to sacerdotalism; or that to obey is better than sacrifice. Faith would be opposed, not to the good deeds which conscience requires, but to works of appeasement by ritual. Justification would be neither an arbitrary ground of confidence, nor a reward upon condition of our disclaiming merit, but rather a verdict of forgiveness upon our repentance, and of acceptance upon the offering of our hearts. It is not a fatal objection, to say that St. Paul would thus teach Natural Religion, unless we were sure that he was bound to contradict it; but it is a confirmation of the view, if it brings his hard sayings into harmony with the Gospels and with the Psalms, as well as with the instincts of our best conscience. If we had dreamed of our nearest kindred in irreconcilable combat, and felt anguish at the thought of opposing either,

it could be no greater relief to awake, and find them at concord, than it would be to some minds to find the antagonism between Nature and Revelation vanishing in a wider grasp and deeper perception of the one, or in a better balanced statement of the other.

"If our philosopher had persuaded us of the moral nature of Justification, he would not shrink from adding that Regeneration is a correspondent giving of insight, or an awakening of forces of the soul. By Resurrection he would mean a spiritual quickening. Salvation would be our deliverance, not from the life-giving God, but from evil and darkness, which are His finite opposites (ὁ ἀντικείμενος). Propitiation would be the recovery of that peace, which cannot be while sin divides us from the Searcher of hearts. The eternal is what belongs to God, as spirit, therefore the negation of things finite and unspiritual, whether world, or letter, or rite of blood. The hateful fires of the vale of Hinnom (Gehenna) are hardly in the strict letter imitated by the God who has pronounced them cursed, but may serve as images of distracted remorse. Heaven is not a place, so much as fulfilment of the love of God. The kingdom of God is no more Romish sacerdotalism than Jewish royalty, but the realization of the Divine Will in our thoughts and lives. This expression of spirit, in deed and form, is generically akin to creation, and illustrates the incarnation. For though the true substance of Deity took body in the Son of Man, they who know the Divine Substance to be Spirit, will conceive of such embodiment of the Eternal Mind very differently from those who abstract all Divine attributes, such as consciousness, forethought, and love, and then imagine a material *residuum*, on which they confer the Holiest name. The Divine attributes are consubstantial with the Divine essence. He who abides in love, abides in God, and God in him. Thus the incarnation becomes with our author as purely spiritual as it was with St. Paul. The son of David by birth is the Son of God by the spirit of holiness. What is flesh, is born of flesh, and what is spirit, is born of spirit.

"If we would estimate the truth of such views, the full import of which hardly lies on the surface, we find two lines of inquiry present themselves as criteria: and each of these divides itself into two branches. First, as regards the subject matter, both spiritual affection and metaphysical reasoning forbid us to confine revelations like those of Christ to the first half century of our era, but show at least affinities of our faith existing in men's minds, anterior to Christianity, and renewed with deep echo from living hearts in many a generation. Again, on the side of external criticism, we find the evidences of our canonical books and of the patristic authors nearest to them, are sufficient to prove illustration in outward act of principles perpetually true; but not adequate to guarantee narratives inherently incredible, or precepts evidently wrong. Hence we are obliged to assume in ourselves a verifying faculty, not unlike the discretion which a mathematician would use in weighing a treatise on geometry, or the liberty which a musician would reserve in reporting a law of harmony. Thus, as we are expressly told, we are to have the witness in ourselves. It is not our part to dictate to Almighty God, that He ought to have spared us this strain upon our consciences; nor in giving us through His Son a deeper revelation of His own presence, was He bound to accompany His gift by a special form of record. Hence there is no antecedent necessity that the least rational view of

the gospel should be the truest, or that our faith should have no human element, and its records be exempt from historical law. Rather we may argue, the more Divine the germ, the more human must be the development."—Pp. 80—83.

The third essay comes from the pen of Mr. Baden Powell. His writings hold no high position among our favourites, though we gladly admit that he did good service in quarters where truth from minds superior to his own could not have obtained an audience because living and working beyond the circle of recognized orthodoxy. The service, however, which he did lay in breaking asunder the incrustations of error rather than in communicating positive and quickening truth. His mind was too materialistic to represent truly and espouse effectually the great spiritual verities of the gospel. The present contribution to "The Study of the Evidences of Christianity" justifies the statement. What its author terms "physical causation" enchains his own mind, as, in his view, it enchains the universe. With him, God is the great mechanician, who having formed the world and established its laws, is held in bondage to the work of his own hands. Accordingly God retires from the activities of the universe, all of which are carried on by physical laws which are supreme and invariable—"the universal self-sustaining and self-evolving powers which pervade all nature" (p. 134). To a mind imbued with such views, miracles are simple impossibilities; for "they bear on purely physical contemplations" (p. 133), and so become palpable physical contradictions. In reading the sentences in which these doctrines are enunciated, we have for a moment imagined ourselves deep in the pages of the "Système de la Nature." Not more emphatically does the Baron d'Holbach assert the sovereignty of what he calls "Nature" against the Author and Sustainer of the universe, than does Mr. Powell assert the iron rule of "physical causes." In both cases, the theory is atheistic. God is expelled from the temple he has built, or cast, bound in adamantine chains, into some dungeon sunk beneath its foundations. A God of whom this may be said is no God. The true God fills, governs and guides the world He made at first and ever renews. "Physical causes" is an unmeaning phrase. All causes are moral or mental. Intelligence is supreme. To be supreme, intelligence must be free. Freedom is involved in intelligence, even as impenetrability is a quality of matter. Intelligence is powerful because it is free, and the Infinite Intelligence possesses unqualified freedom and boundless power. Hence God is at once the Sovereign and the Creator of all things,—the one sole, proper Cause, whose thought is existence, whose will is law, and whose law is phenomenal being, with all its qualities, movements and issues. The universe, then, is simply God's uttered thought. That thought

uttered according to his good pleasure, the same good pleasure now makes permanent, giving rise to order and beauty,—now modifies and varies, giving rise to exceptional men, as Homer, Socrates, Shakspeare, Milton,—or to exceptional phenomena, as the signs shewn by Jesus of the divine presence by which he was attended, and of which his life itself was the greatest and most convincing. That order and these exceptions are not arbitrary, but designed to fulfil the purposes of Infinite Goodness by contributing, each after its kind, and each with effect alike needful and powerful, to the education of the human species—the grand end of the divine government as seen here on the earth. The miracles of Jesus then enter into the general plan and form part of the general harmony of the moral government of the world, in promoting which "physical causes" have at once their reason and their justification.

We have put forth these views because we are convinced that hostility to the miracles of the gospel rises or falls with the conception entertained of God. Miracles are biblical facts, and to be rightly appreciated and judged must be contemplated under the light in which the Bible places its Divine Author. There all things are of God, who is at once in, through and over all. As such, God's word is as free and powerful to produce the Christ with all his prerogatives and signs, as he is to command light to be, and to distribute light among the choirs of heaven. So enamoured is Mr. Powell of his physical theory of the universe, that he even denies to God, or at least to our apprehensions of God, a liberty of action which he concedes to men.

"The most seemingly improbable events in *human* history may be perfectly credible, on sufficient testimony, however contradicting ordinary experience of human motives and conduct—simply because we cannot assign any limits to the varieties of human dispositions, passions, or tendencies, or the extent to which they may be influenced by circumstances of which, perhaps, we have little or no knowledge to guide us. But no such cases would have the remotest applicability to alleged violations of the laws of *matter*, or interruptions of the course of *physical* causes."—P. 132.

Testimony then may, it seems, be received in some cases as a sufficient voucher of events contradicting ordinary experience. If this is true of human agency, why not of divine? Why is it admitted of the former? Because to us the latitude of human action is unbounded. What, then, is the Infinite Mind less unbounded than the finite? You shrink from declaring an act of the creature impossible because he may possess resources of which you are not aware; but God's mode and extent of action you have no scruple to determine and define, and any way are very sure He did not, because He could not, still a storm on the Lake of Galilee, though He does still storms there even now constantly; nor open the eyes of the blind, nor unstop the deaf

ear, though in the same breath you declare Him the creator of both eye and ear, and the bestower of all their functions and gratifications. No! God may give, He may take away, but restore He cannot, except He employ the physician's skill—which very skill is not so much the physician's as God's!

We must declare that Mr. Baden Powell's science looks not a little like the "science falsely so called" rebuked by the apostle Paul: it is equally narrow and pretentious. The chief source of our author's hallucination arises from his persisting to judge a religious fact by what he terms a "physical law." The miracles recorded in the New Testament are to be regarded not in the abstract, but as forming a part of a religion whose ground-thoughts are these—God is the Author of all things; God is the Father of the human family; God governs the universe with a view to the education of the members of that family; among the schoolmasters God raised up and appointed to their work was Jesus of Nazareth, who was called God's Son because he was so like God; that Son, as being like God, possessed God's spirit, and so wielded God's power; this he did in union and co-operation with God, and with an express and avowed view to the highest good of man; that good was best secured, first by the human and superhuman life of the Son of God, and secondly by the wonderful works which he performed, all stamped with God's own image, and so all fitted to promote God's great work. In consequence of this multiform yet harmonious system of divine manifestations, the world was "translated out of darkness into marvellous light," and has ever since been advancing in all that makes man free, great and happy. The operation will proceed, until the spirit of Christ becomes the spirit of man, and the spirit of man is filled with immortal blessedness in union with the spirit of God. This is an outline of the system in connection with which the miracles of Jesus are found to stand. As a part of that system are they to be contemplated and judged. If they prove to be in harmony with that system, you can disallow and destroy them only by disallowing and destroying the system itself. The miracles stand or fall with the gospel; and the gospel, as the word of God, is imperishable.

If the miracles of the New Testament are thus indissolubly linked with its religion, then it seems a strange thing that an avowed and recognized minister of that religion should be engaged in an attempt to upset the miracles. The author of this essay has ere this appeared before the Judge of all the earth, and in consequence our words shall be measured; but inasmuch as he has left his thoughts to work for either evil or good as may be, those words must be honest. And we confess that we partly blame and partly pity one who enjoyed the honours and ate the bread of a religious Establishment whose fundamental principles he studiously laboured to undermine. We could indeed find

reason to honour that Establishment in the latitude with which she allows her sons to speak, as illustrated in this essay especially, did we not fear that instead of proceeding from an enlightened and conscientious love of Christian liberty, it proceeds from indifference and disregard. Opinions of all sorts are tolerated by and in the Church of England so long as the Church itself is left to enjoy the honours and emoluments of its connection with the State. With impunity you may assail the miracles, but it will go hard with you if you assail episcopacy. You may even put forth materialistic representations of God's relation to the universe, but you must not call in question the apostolicity of baronial archbishops and opulent deans. Of course we would rather have the actual toleration than an active bigotry. Yet we cannot forget that a toleration which is accompanied by such anathemas as are used to fence round the Athanasian Creed, is self-condemned and dishonest, and as such must, as indeed it does, work in favour of an extreme latitudinarianism which declares all opinions of equal value, and so declares that truth is a mere fancy. Not without pain, therefore, do we look on the volume that lies before us. Intended to bear testimony to certain convictions, in which convictions there is much we believe to be true, it witnesses from first to last to the immoral tendency and operation of the Established Church, as professing one thing in her formularies and articles of union, and teaching another thing by the pens of acknowledged representatives. Here the contrariety is too obvious and too broad to be denied. The Church of England, in her most liberal mood, professes to be founded on holy Scripture. Holy Scripture contains narratives of miraculous deeds. Hence consistency requires that the Church of England and those narratives should be one. In fact, they are sundered by some of its clergy. What is this but to disown the Bible as well as the miracles—in other words, to cut away the foundations of the religion for whose support and exposition the Establishment exists in so much dignity and wealth? Such freedom is spurious, such toleration is rotten, and such a ministration of Christianity is antichristian.

The principal blame of this inconsistency lies against the Church itself. The parent vice is to be found in the connection of that Church with the State. State-Churches have in all ages and all countries exhibited a similarly lamentable spectacle whenever the advance of thought left them in its rear. A religious Establishment without a creed is an impossibility; and as creeds are nothing but formulas of human opinion, and as human opinions change as time and circumstance change, so is a divarication between Establishments and their creeds inevitable in the ceaseless progressions of society. Hence State-Churches are in their principle antichristian. Equally are they snares to conscience. Thorough honesty in connection with them seems to us impos-

sible. And yet honesty is the very soul of religion. And the question of "Honest or not?" is a question for every individual, and not merely for the communities and associations with which individuals may be connected. Accordingly there is no salve for my conscience if I think to throw the blame of my inconsistency on my church. If my church allows a lie, that is a very good reason for quitting my church, but no reason at all for my being a *particeps criminis*. And here we cannot keep back our judgment that the blame of inconsistency, as exemplified in this volume, does not lie wholly or exclusively on the Church. In part at least it lies on the authors of these essays; and they are the more open to the blame because they are not ordinary men, because they obviously possess moral light, and because they put themselves forward as reformers of the age. It is not an exculpation to plead their courage in thus avowing obnoxious truths. We admit and we commend that courage, and our commendation would be unrestricted and hearty were the courage less faltering and more thorough. As it is, the essayists seem to us to be in the position of men who will tell all the truth they can tell with due regard to the safety of their professional position. Such a proceeding lacks the principle of honesty, and so is very much out of place in ministers of a religion which in regard to conscience will have all or none.

The fourth essay is devoted by its author, the Rev. H. B. Wilson, B.D., Vicar of Great Stoughton, Hunts, to a defence of the principle of a National Church in general, and of the English Established Church in particular. Treating the subject under the two abstractions of multitudinism or nationalism, representing the establishment of religion, on the one side,—and, on the other, of individualism, representing Dissent or Nonconformity, the writer gives a decided preference to the former,—writing, however, in a liberal tone. We have already shewn what opinion we entertain on this point, and do not intend to re-open the subject. We have only two remarks to offer. We think that in describing Nonconformity as individualism, Mr. Wilson has secured a verdict against himself; for individualism is the spirit of Christianity, the first aim of which in regard to man is to mould individuals, as such, into the likeness of Christ, and so to make a perfect church out of an infinite number of Christ-like individuals. Alike condemnatory of his views is the following short passage; for the English Church does require "of many men a unanimity in speculative doctrine which is unattainable, and a uniformity of historical belief which can never exist." We quote these words the rather because they seem to involve on the part of their writer an uneasy moral consciousness, a wish to testify against the moral infelicity of his own position.

"Jesus Christ has not revealed His religion as a theology of the intellect, nor as an historical faith; and it is a stifling of the true Christian

life, both in the individual and in the Church, to require of many men a unanimity in speculative doctrine, which is unattainable, and a uniformity of historical belief, which can never exist. The true Christian life is the consciousness of bearing a part in a great moral order, of which the highest agency upon earth has been committed to the Church. Let us not oppress this work nor complicate the difficulties with which it is surrounded; 'not making the heart of the righteous sad, whom the Lord hath not made sad, nor strengthening the hands of the wicked by promising him life.'

"There is enough indeed to sadden us in the doubtful warfare which the good wages with the evil, both within us and without us. How few, under the most favourable conditions, learn to bring themselves face to face with the great moral law, which is the manifestation of the Will of God! The greater part can only detect the evil when it comes forth from them, nearly as when any other might observe it. We cannot, in the matter of those who are brought under the highest influences of the Christian Church, any more than in the case of mankind viewed in their ordinary relations, give any account of the apparently useless expenditure of power—of the apparent overbearing generally of the higher law by the lower—of the apparent poverty of result from the operation of a wonderful machinery—of the seeming waste of myriads of germs, for the sake of a few mature growths."—Pp. 204, 205.

Of the fifth essay, "On the Mosaic Cosmogony, by C. W. Goodwin, M.A.," we shall merely remark that it handles with less felicity and success than might have been expected a subject of great importance, and on which the mind of English and American churches has been more moved than on most of the other subjects brought into view by this "Broad Church" manifesto.

The sixth essay, "Tendencies of Religious Thought in England, 1688-1750," seems somewhat out of place. It is, indeed, full of instruction, but has no very obvious bearing on the general tenor of the volume. It is a less serious objection to say that, though instructive, it is somewhat dry and unattractive.

We have hastened onwards thus because we wished to delay a little on the last essay, which is the gem of the volume, "On the Interpretation of Scripture, by Benjamin Jowett, M.A., Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Oxford." In some of the preceding pages we have met with a degree of caution, a halting apparently before a bolder and more valuable truth than that just uttered, a dim consciousness of keeping back a part of the price. Here there is a full and unrestricted outspokenness. The writer utters what is in his mind without restraint. His treatment also covers the whole subject. It is a volume within the limits of an essay. At least most of the principal points relating to the science of sacred exegesis find some notice in these admirable pages. With slight exceptions, the style is as good as the matter. It may indeed be declared that the learned author has written on a scholar's subject in a way to

suit any ordinarily cultivated person. We state the fact because we are desirous to win the attention of young persons, nor least young women, to this instructive and interesting composition. We plead guilty to a special reason; the essay embodies an undesigned but effectual justification of Unitarianism. Here are the principles of interpretation which are taught to our divinity students while at college; here are the principles of interpretation which underlie the teachings given by our ministers from the pulpit; and here are even results of the same principles of interpretation as set forth in our Unitarian manuals and embodied in our Unitarian sermons. Here they are, those principles and those results, we do not say derived from Unitarian sources, but certainly wonderfully corroborative of our Unitarian position. If these instructions are the independent products of Professor Jowett's own reading and thinking, they are an independent evidence to the general truth of Unitarian Christianity. If they come out of the spirit of free inquiry in its application to the most advanced and clearly-ascertained scholarship of the age, they are not only an independent but a very strong evidence to the general truth of Unitarian Christianity. Believing that the suppositions we have put are to a great extent simple facts, we hail a fellow-believer in a fellow-inquirer, and thank him for the testimony undesignedly given by him to a view of the gospel of Christ which has long been dear to us, and which becomes increasingly dear to us with the increase of our knowledge, experience and years.

One of our own writers, a man of no mean ability though fond of paradox, has described the Unitarian interpretation of scripture as of but secondary merit. Did we hold such an opinion, we should openly renounce Unitarian views; for there could be no doubt in our mind that if our method of dealing with scripture was inferior, a superior cast of thought could not be educed thereby. That a wrong road should lead to a right end is wholly improbable. The allegation finds an answer in Mr. Jowett's essay, which will be recognized by the students in our Colleges as in substance the same as that by which their scriptural studies were and are directed. One passage, however, in this essay, giving an outline of the history of interpretation, affords us an opportunity for putting side by side the greater interpreters of the church, divided into the two classes of men of resistance and men of progress. These are the words:

"It" (a "History of the Interpretation of Scripture") "would mark the different epochs of interpretation from the time when the living word was in the process of becoming a book to Origen and Tertullian, from Origen to Jerome and Augustine, from Jerome and Augustine to Abelard and Aquinas; again making a new beginning with the revival of literature, from Erasmus, the father of biblical criticism in more recent times,

with Calvin and Beza for his immediate successors, through Grotius and Hammond, down to De Wette and Meier, our own contemporaries."—P. 339.

Men of resistance.	*Men of progress.*
1. Tertullian (hardly).	1. Origen.
2. Jerome.	2. Abelard.
3. Augustine.	3. Erasmus.
4. Aquinas.	4. Beza.
5. Calvin (hardly).	5. Grotius.
6. Meier (hardly).	6. Hammond.
	7. De Wette.

The majority is on the side of progress. But in the minority are names that have some claim to be transferred to the other side. Tertullian was free in his inquiries and did not end in orthodoxy, if the Athanasian Creed is to be taken as the standard. Calvin dealt freely with the scholastic notions of the Trinity, in consequence of penetrating into the spirit of the New Testament writings. Meier would not pass muster before a board of ordinary English Episcopal or Independent doctors. Passing to the majority, we remark that Origen, the father of the science of biblical interpretation, was a Unitarian, expressly forbidding prayer to Christ. A Unitarian also was Abelard. Erasmus appears to have held Arian views, and so was a Unitarian. Grotius, who in his own day was not without reason accused of Socinianism, drew largely from the exegetical treasures of the Socinian church, the true founder of biblical exegesis since the revival of letters; for what Grotius took from them, in both method and matter, passed especially through Arminius, Episcopius and others of the same liberal school of theological thought, into the great currents of scriptural information, and appeared in full measure in Hammond, whence it has been widely and generally diffused. The processes and the treasures of even the recent German school of interpreters, of which De Wette and Meier may be accounted the head, and who, not having been yet surpassed, may be considered as having uttered the last word in the long series of investigations into the meaning of the New Testament, are in the main indebted for their value to the principles and practice of these men of progress, who have been the lights of the church and will ever remain its glory. Moreover, these men of progress are all animated by the spirit of continual growth which characterizes Unitarians; the majority of them held and maintained opinions not dissimilar to our own; and De Wette, the prince of critics, scarcely ever fails to decide on the Unitarian side in the passages whose meaning is matter of dispute between them and Unitarian authorities. The words cited from Professor Jowett limit the range of our observations, else we should put in a claim for high position on behalf of John Locke, Dr. John Taylor, Dr. Lardner and Dr. Priestley, not to mention names of inferior note, yet

highly respectable. In one thing all these great men agreed—they sought truth in the love of it, assured that the more they inquired with truth-loving minds, the more fully would God make known to them his holy will; while the men of resistance aimed mainly to preserve the traditions of the past, and with that view to withstand innovations. In the spirit of the former class is the volume of Essays and Reviews conceived and executed. A similar mission to theirs it is sent out to fulfil (would that its moral spirit were equally high, pure and heroic!), and on that account we bid it God-speed, and should do so heartily were its positive teachings less in accordance with our own views than they are.

In the development of his views, Mr. Jowett has occasion to state a number of principles to be observed and practised on the part of the biblical interpreter. We had made some preparations fitted to shew that these principles are found uttered in Unitarian authors of acknowledged authority. Going back into the Transylvanian church of the seventeenth century, we find in their *Summa Universæ Theologiæ* principles of the same import and bearing, while these may be traced back into the many exegetical pieces which enrich the series of bulky tomes forming the collection of folios called the Library of the Fratres Socini. We must not, however, attempt a volume when professing only to write a review. Yet, if only to shew that we speak not without a good foundation, we transcribe some passages from this essay which differ little, if at all, from the views we ourselves entertain, and in which the intelligent and well-instructed Unitarian reader will recognize opinions having at least a general agreement with his own:

The proper source of our knowledge of what Inspiration is.

"The nature of inspiration can only be known from the examination of Scripture. There is no other source to which we can turn for information; and we have no right to assume some imaginary doctrine of inspiration like the infallibility of the Roman Catholic Church. To the question, 'What is inspiration?' the first answer therefore is, 'That idea of Scripture which we gather from the knowledge of it.' It is no mere *a-priori* notion, but one to which the book is itself a witness. It is a fact which we infer from the study of Scripture—not of one portion only, but of the whole. Obviously then it embraces writings of very different kinds—the book of Esther, for example, or the Song of Solomon, as well as the Gospel of St. John. It is reconcileable with the mixed good and evil of the characters of the Old Testament, which nevertheless does not exclude them from the favour of God, with the attribution to the Divine Being of actions at variance with that higher revelation, which he has given of himself in the Gospel; it is not inconsistent with imperfect or opposite aspects of the truth as in the book of Job or Ecclesiastes, with variations of fact in the Gospels or the books of Kings and Chronicles, with inaccuracies of language in the Epistles of St. Paul. For these are all found in Scripture; neither is there any reason why

they should not be, except a general impression that Scripture ought to have been written in a way different from what it has. A principle of progressive revelation admits them all; and this is already contained in the words of our Saviour, 'Moses because of the hardness of your hearts;' or even in the Old Testament, 'Henceforth there shall be no more this proverb in the house of Israel.' For what is progressive is necessarily imperfect in its earlier stages, and even erring to those who come after, whether it be the maxims of a half-civilized world which are compared with those of a civilized one, or the law with the Gospel. Scripture itself points the way to answer the moral objections to Scripture. Lesser difficulties remain, but only such as would be found commonly in writings of the same age or country. There is no more reason why imperfect narratives should be excluded from Scripture than imperfect grammar; no more ground for expecting that the New Testament would be logical or Aristotelian in form, than that it would be written in Attic Greek."—Pp. 347, 348.

Scripture forcibly misapplied.

"The temper of accommodation shows itself especially in two ways: first, in the attempt to adapt the truths of Scripture to the doctrines of the creeds; secondly, in the adaptation of the precepts and maxims of Scripture to the language or practice of our own age. Now the creeds are acknowledged to be a part of Christianity; they stand in a close relation to the words of Christ and his Apostles; nor can it be said that any heterodox formula makes a nearer approach to a simple and scriptural rule of faith. Neither is anything gained by contrasting them with Scripture, in which the germs of the expressions used in them are sufficiently apparent. Yet it does not follow that they should be pressed into the service of the interpreter. The growth of ideas in the interval which separated the first century from the fourth or sixth makes it impossible to apply the language of the one to the explanation of the other. Between Scripture and the Nicene or Athanasian Creed, a world of the understanding comes in—that world of abstractions and second notions; and mankind are no longer at the same point as when the whole of Christianity was contained in the words, 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou mayest be saved,' when the Gospel centred in the attachment to a living or recently departed friend and Lord. The language of the New Testament is the first utterance and consciousness of the mind of Christ; or the immediate vision of the Word of life (1 John i. 1) as it presented itself before the eyes of his first followers, or as the sense of his truth and power grew upon them (Romans i. 3, 4); the other is the result of three or four centuries of reflection and controversy. And although this last had a truth suited to its age, and its technical expressions have sunk deep into the heart of the human race, it is not the less unfitted to be the medium by the help of which Scripture is to be explained. If the occurrence of the phraseology of the Nicene age in a verse of the Epistles would detect the spuriousness of the verse in which it was found, how can the Nicene or Athanasian Creed be a suitable instrument for the interpretation of Scripture? That advantage which the New Testament has over the teaching of the Church, as representing what may be termed the childhood of the Gospel, would be lost if its language were required to conform to that of the Creeds."—Pp. 353, 354.

Proving a doctrine from Scripture.

"Nor indeed is it easy to say what is the meaning of 'proving a doctrine from Scripture.' For when we demand logical equivalents and similarity of circumstances, when we balance adverse statements, St. James and St. Paul, the New Testament with the Old, it will be hard to demonstrate from Scripture any complex system either of doctrine or practice. The Bible is not a book of statutes in which words have been chosen to cover the multitude of cases, but in the greater portion of it, especially the Gospels and Epistles, 'like a man talking to his friend.' Nay, more, it is a book written in the East, which is in some degree liable to be misunderstood, because it speaks the language and has the feeling of Eastern lands. Nor can we readily determine in explaining the words of our Lord or of St. Paul, how much (even of some of the passages just quoted) is to be attributed to Oriental modes of speech. Expressions which would be regarded as rhetorical exaggerations in the Western world are the natural vehicles of thought to an Eastern people. How great then must be the confusion where an attempt is made to draw out these Oriental modes with the severity of a philosophical or legal argument! Is it not such a use of the words of Christ which he himself rebukes when he says, 'It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing.' (John vi. 52, 63.)"—Pp. 366, 367.

The essayist has well summed up the laws of interpretation he lays down in these valuable words:

"Of what has been said, this is the sum:—'That Scripture, like other books, has one meaning, which is to be gathered from itself without reference to the adaptations of Fathers or Divines; and without regard to *a-priori* notions about its nature and origin. It is to be interpreted like other books, with attention to the character of its authors, and the prevailing state of civilization and knowledge, with allowance for peculiarities of style and language, and modes of thought and figures of speech. Yet not without a sense that as we read there grows upon us the witness of God in the world, anticipating in a rude and primitive age the truth that was to be, shining more and more unto the perfect day in the life of Christ, which again is reflected from different points of view in the teaching of His Apostles.'"—P. 404.

Were we, however, to lay before the reader all that is true and useful in this most excellent essay, we should have to transcribe the bulk of it. We conclude with two additional remarks. From several positions here laid down we are compelled to dissent. The writer, for instance, seems to us to undervalue the Old-Testament Scriptures as an aid to the interpretation of the New-Testament Scriptures. The former, in our judgment, is the key to the latter. After making every allowance for the modifying influence of Greek thought through the Alexandrine school of theological and philosophical speculation, we find in the older Scriptures the root of that religious development of which the fruit is given in the Gospels and the Epistles. Our second remark regards a misrepresentation into which so well-informed a scholar and so liberal a writer ought not to have fallen. On p. 355, Unitarians are represented as holding Christ

to be "a mere man." The representation is incorrect. We have never known a Unitarian who held Christ to be "a mere man." No one can be a Unitarian who holds Christ to be "a mere man;" for a Unitarian is one who receives Christ as God's messenger and representative to a sinful world. Divinity in some way is ascribed to Christ by every Unitarian who knows the reason of the hope that is in him. Find the element in inspiration; in God's constant presence; in divine knowledge and power communicated to Jesus; in his official appointment, preparation and dignity; in his divinely-constituted relations to his age and to mankind; in his pure and lofty wisdom and his holy and God-devoted life; in his being the word of God uttered in what Jesus was, did, said and suffered; in the honours bestowed upon him by the gift of the spirit of God without measure, by his transfiguration, his resurrection, his ascension, his constant supervision of his church, and his final triumph in the universal prevalence of the gospel;—find it in any or in all of these forms and representations (and doubtless various are the views under which Christ's glory is set forth in Scripture), you will, on going a little below the surface, discover that they have a point of agreement and a common unity in the acknowledgment of a divine element as differencing Jesus from other men; and in that divine element Unitarians, no less than other disciples of Christ, find their bond of union one with another, and their ground of trust in the one Head of the church, the one Teacher, Lord and Saviour of the world. If we may venture to make a suggestion to one so qualified to instruct others, we would respectfully suggest to Professor Jowett that he should make himself acquainted with some of the best Unitarian writers before he again undertakes to characterize the Unitarian form of thought. J. R. B.

LECTURES ON THE DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT.*

THE first of these volumes has been published at the suggestion of the gentleman to whom it is inscribed. It consists of eight lectures, which the author delivered "some years since in the ordinary course of pulpit duty." We cordially concur in the judgment that they are "likely to be useful to a wider circle" than that which had already heard them. Learned, able and convincing, they are of a character, in regard to Christian feeling, calculated to fix the attention of all persons who simply desire

* Lectures on the Doctrine of Atonement. By J. Scott Porter. Pp. 166. London—Whitfield.

Six Lectures on the Scriptural Doctrine of Reconciliation, or Atonement, and connected Subjects. By Russell Lant Carpenter, B.A. Pp. 158. London—Whitfield.

to understand the truth. It is our duty to commend works of this nature to the study of our orthodox friends and connections. From the neglect of such a course, we lose many excellent opportunities of rendering service alike to them and to the cause of God.

Of the same high character are the six lectures of Mr. Carpenter, though they appear in a somewhat plain and unpretending form. They contain strictures on a publication by the Rev. Enoch Mellor, in which the Unitarian doctrines appear to have been unfairly treated. There is in these lectures much interesting dissertation apart from what may be considered as purely controversial, and the spirit in which the author writes is admirable, quite in keeping with the disposition manifested in the following passage from his Preface:

"Doctrines will never be truly discerned unless approached in their own spirit. We shall never understand how God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, till there is in us the spirit of Christ reconciling us to each other. Controversy seems unfavourable to reconciliation: I fear that the present one has stimulated some displays of bigotry and party spirit; but I have also the pleasure of believing that it has promoted that wider knowledge which will lead to a truer concord."

On this point, as we are introducing to our readers two volumes which are professedly controversial, a few words will not be out of place. There have been those amongst us, as well as in other Dissenting bodies, who conceived that the period of controversy was past, never to be renewed, and that henceforth the propagation of truth must be effected by the indirect but powerful influence of zeal in labours of charity and in the education of the young. We have never been able to understand the logic of this alternative. There is ample room and pressing need for both; and each man amongst us should work according to his capabilities in either field of useful employment, without regarding with jealousy the action of others whose vocation summons them to labour in the other direction. There are men who are able, at fit time and in proper place, to serve the cause of truth on both grounds, as the two authors are known to have done whose works are at this moment before us.

It has been sometimes urged, when we have endeavoured to impress upon our friends the duty of rectifying erroneous common opinions respecting the Unitarian doctrine, that it is a mistake to rely so much upon the intellect of mankind, who are more easily moved in feeling, and to whom the argument of a holy Christian life appeals with greater force than all the syllogisms of scholastic debate. We remark, as before, that we cannot see how the one thing should exclude the other. No reasonable man would ever think of maintaining an appeal to the intellect upon a religious question, in which he could not at the same time rest upon the practical support of a religious life. We have to

persuade as well as to convince; but there is little hope of our succeeding in persuasion if we do not at the same time endeavour to satisfy the intelligence and the judgment of those whom we would bring to the simple truth.

In this matter, as in others not less important, people have grown weary of the form and therefore neglect the substance. The two works which we commend to their attention may assist them to overcome this fastidiousness of liberalism. They will find in these works nothing offensive to any reasonable charity, and no lack of modern interest. Full justice is done to the other side: upon this the authors have evidently laboured with jealous care. The subjects are treated with sustained interest, and with all the condensation which the nature of the case admitted. Mr. Carpenter, though repelling an attack from a near neighbour, is uniformly candid and conciliatory. All that is excellent in the best orthodox treatment of evangelical topics is united in his manner of exposition and argument with the good sense and the calmness peculiar to our own body. In like manner, with all the learned research which they display, and with all their force of philosophic reasoning, the lectures of Mr. Porter are thoroughly practical, the work of one obviously possessed with the desire to win men to the truth as it is in Jesus. He does not notice certain later works of the orthodox schools which exhibit the modifying power of modern knowledge upon the forms of their theological opinion. But this is a small matter. The work condenses the largest and most amply sufficient knowledge of the varied phases of scriptural representation upon the subject of Atonement; while the Appendix, occupying a fourth of the whole volume, is especially interesting and valuable. Several of the notes are of an exhaustive character, forming complete though brief essays upon the most important points, such as required this kind of treatment.

It would not be possible to exaggerate the importance of the subject of the reconciliation of our nature to the Divine will. If this were well comprehended in all its relations to the proper business of human life, no person could ask, with what gospel is our ministry commissioned, or what satisfaction and consolation does it bring to the real wants and interests of sinful men. The reader of these discourses will feel that a preacher must be of singularly cold nature or strangely fettered by idle social conventions, who cannot with the utmost earnestness apply the great lesson of Christianity to the needs of the common modern life. It is the great question of theology, "How shall man be just with his Maker?" It surpasses in practical importance all other questions, and it is one upon which we have the sympathies of large numbers amongst the orthodox, whose theorizings upon the legal value of the death of Christ have been reduced by the progress of general enlightenment to the vaguest spectral form of belief.

There is no topic upon which we can speak from the Scriptures in fuller or more commanding tone; at the same time it is well known that no question is more encumbered in the popular belief with inveterate fallacies and with almost ineradicable prejudices. It is indeed among the most useful labours which the religious teacher can undertake who comes forward to the relief of the people from the mischievous sophisms by which they have been so long deluded. The controversy may grow distasteful to those who no longer need it for themselves; but many of us can well remember what a blessing it would have been to them to have met with such works as those before us in the early days of their struggle into the light of scriptural truth. It should be remembered that a doctrine like ours can only spread by the means of personal conviction. It was so in the times of the apostles. We cannot ensure that our own children should learn it, if, under the impulse of a false liberalism, we refuse to teach them. Much less can we hope for large accessions to our body unless we are prepared to labour, in the spirit of the apostles, "reasoning out of the Scriptures," convincing and converting others as we have been convinced and persuaded ourselves. Such labours have never been without effect when we have vigorously and earnestly pursued them; and if there be any particular in which we can improve upon the controversial writings of a former generation, it is our duty to make the improvement, but certainly not to throw aside the instrument which, with all its imperfections, has fashioned us as a denomination to all the good which our body enjoys.

There is another view in which we are disposed to rate most highly the value of the two works under review. They are thoroughly scriptural. A person cannot read them without deriving from them considerable profit in regard to his knowledge of the sacred books. They afford excellent illustration of the application to these books of those admirable canons of interpretation which the Oxford Professor of Greek has lately set forth. Surely we must all have too sincere a respect for our own position as a needed testimony to the simplicity of scriptural truth, not to wish that the work of enlightened exposition should not be taken out of our hands by men with whose public professions of orthodoxy we cannot sympathize, while their teaching is substantially the same with our own. It ought to be felt as our particular duty to lead the intellect of the time, in conformity with the Christian spirit, in the study of the Holy Scriptures. If we are right in our views, we need not fear to press them upon public attention, which will receive them gratefully when it shall better comprehend them. If in anything we have erred, perhaps by too close an adherence to the superstitions of orthodoxy with its minute verbal inspiration, it is within our power and duty to re-consider and amend,—in any case, to be at the head of the

time in this our special function of real, in opposition to factitious interpretation of the Bible. We entirely agree with Mr. Jowett in his conviction that the true interpretation of the Scriptures, carried out by the free intellect under the guardianship of the Christian heart, is the sole hope of effective union of the divided members of Christ. Do we not know that the Bible is misunderstood? Do we not constantly hear it charged with doctrines which are not the teachings of Christ or of the apostles? Has not our time slipped from under the yoke of a gospel overburdened with inventions of men? Is it not the popular habit with the Scriptures to cause a few scattered texts to tyrannize over the whole sense of their own context and of the entire books to which they belong? We would urge, then, that our instructors should take a lesson from works like those of Mr. Porter and Mr. Carpenter, and prepare themselves to make on every proper occasion full, clear, pointed expositions of the sacred writers. Too much of it there can hardly be, so that it be properly and thoughtfully done. Particularly on the subject of the great reconciliation, the case is hopeless for the unlearned hearer of the gospel if this help to his own private reading of the Bible be unsupplied. The false associations of orthodox Calvinism are too numerous and strong, and they have obtained generally too secure a hold upon certain common feelings, to be broken up without the aid which the pulpit ought to afford of incessant and well-conceived exposition of the Christian books. The following passage, taken almost indiscriminately from Mr. Porter's work (p. 47), will serve to indicate his general views, while it illustrates the value of sound and forcible exposition. We could especially desire that our younger members should be well furnished in this important respect of the knowledge of the Scriptures.

"You will perceive that the whole force of the argument turns upon the meaning of the word '*for*' in the texts which state that Christ died for us, and suffered for us, and shed his blood for us. If that word necessarily signifies '*in our room*' or '*instead of us*,' it would be difficult to resist the interpretation which our brethren are anxious to put upon these passages. But such is not the case. There are in the Greek language, which is the original language of the New Testament, several particles which are indifferently translated by this little word '*for*.' One of these particles (αντι) generally signifies *in the room* or *stead of another*. But this particle is never used in the New Testament when the sacred writers speak of Christ as having 'died for men.' The words which they actually use (προ, υπερ) have a much more comprehensive signification, and imply, what indeed all Christians believe, and none more sincerely than we, that Christ died for *the good* of men, in *their cause*, on *their account*. This fact ought to settle the question, so far as it depends on the interpretation of these texts. The sacred writers had it in their power to employ a phrase which in its obvious meaning would have expressed the doctrine of vicarious punishment; but *they*

have never once employed it. The phrases which they have used simply express a fact which no Christian ever can or ever did deny; a fact which we at least not only admit, but on just occasion constantly assert and strenuously maintain, viz., that the death of Christ was a voluntary death, in the service and for the benefit of mankind. That such is the true interpretation of this language in the passages now under consideration is evident even from some of the texts themselves. Peter, exhorting servants to bear patiently the severities of cruel masters, says, 'For even hereunto were ye called, for Christ also hath suffered for us, *leaving us an example* that ye should walk in his steps' (1 Peter ii. 21). He 'died for us,' i.e. died for our advantage; and one of the advantages that his death conferred is, that we have a pattern of godly meekness under cruel wrong. So also, in 1 John iii. 16: 'Hereby perceive we love, because he laid down his life for us, and *we also ought to lay down our lives for the brethren,*' i.e. in their defence, or for their confirmation in the faith. A striking example occurs in the writings of the apostle Paul: 'If one died for all, then were all dead; and he died for all, *that they who live should not live henceforth unto themselves, but unto him who died and rose again for them*' (2 Cor. v. 14), i.e. Christ died *for all*, that all might be prevailed on to walk in newness of life, conformably to the precepts and example of him who died on their behalf. The same apostle says, '*for a good man some would even dare to die*' (Romans v. 7), that is, not to have his sins imputed and to bear his punishment, for that would scarcely be consistent with the fact of his being a good man, but to do him a service or to protect him from injury; and in the very same sense, as the apostle's language clearly implies, 'while we were yet sinners Christ died for us,' that is, died to confer on us advantages and benefits. Remember that the High Priest moved the Sanhedrim to consent to the murder of Jesus by persuading them that it was expedient that *one man should die for the people* (John xi. 50). Not, certainly, *as a vicarious victim*, to bear the penalty of their offences, that was a doctrine of which the unbelieving Jews had no notion; but, as he himself explained his words, he thought it desirable to put Jesus to death in order to ward off from them an impending danger, 'that the whole nation might not perish' under the jealous anger of the Roman government. Christians are exhorted to be ready to die for Christ: 'Unto you it is given, on behalf of Christ (Gr. *for Christ*), not only to believe on him, but also to suffer for his sake' (Gr. *to suffer for him*) (Phil. i. 29). The apostle Paul says that he took pleasure in 'reproaches, persecutions and distresses for Christ's sake' (Gr. *for Christ*) (2 Cor. xii. 10). He says that he 'was always delivered to death for Jesus' sake' (Gr. *because of Jesus*) (2 Cor. iv. 11). And he declared that he endured all things for the elects' sakes (Gr. *because of the elect*), that they also might obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus (2 Tim. ii. 10). What pæans would have been sung if this had been affirmed of Christ! I apprehend that no one who calmly considers the force of these expressions, and the manner in which they are applied, will feel any difficulty in explaining the texts in which our blessed Saviour is said to have died, and to have suffered, and to have endured grief, for us."

If the reader compare with this a passage from Mr. Carpenter's lectures (p. 66), he will perceive with what varied interest the

exposition of the sacred writings may be accompanied, and what a field it opens for every resource of ability in the way of illustration and argument.

"I have not forgotten that it is written, 'He hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him;' but if our righteousness is as unreal as was the sin of Christ, it will profit us little. The latter clause, *who knew no sin*, explains the first, *he hath made him to be sin*. The omniscient God did not regard Jesus as *sin;* on the contrary, God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself. Christ's obedience unto death was a manifestation of his holiness and goodness. . . . 'God spared not his only Son, but delivered him up for us all.' There were *two* laws,—one, which was *passing away*, by whose administration he was put to death, *that* law, by his death, was repealed. Another, eternal, which by his death was *ratified and sanctified*, the law of love, by which he gave himself to death. So, in the case of the emancipator we spoke of, *he gave himself to death*, he entered on a course in which he knew that he should have to die, in obedience to what he was assured was the will of Heaven; the divine law of love of the enslaved which was glorified in his sufferings; but he was put to death by a law which those who glorified his sufferings hated as unjust and wicked. The law which punishes a righteous man with death, is a law of sin and death; the law which gives the righteous man power to brave, endure and conquer death, is the law of spirit and life. Now, was Jesus *punished by God's law?* No! he was blessed and rewarded by it. How could it punish him while it set joy before him, a joy for which he endured the cross and despised the shame! As well say that the law of maternal love *punishes* the mother who chooses suffering for the unspeakable joy of saving her child. We are not punished when we are permitted to suffer with Christ. When Paul filled up that which was behind of the afflictions of Christ for his church's sake, he rejoiced in his sufferings; and whilst the children of the world deem all pain a penalty, those who suffer according to the will of God commit their souls unto him, as to a faithful creator: and we count them blessed as they thus enter into the joy of their Lord. It is, then, when we look at Christ on the cross as the unbelieving Jews did, that we deem him *punished:* when we look on him as we believe that God did, we see him the *beloved of the Father*."

The first of Mr. Carpenter's lectures is on the nature of Sin; the second shews the kingly quality of Mercy compared with the necessary correctional discipline of the Father; the fourth details the scenes of Gethsemane and Calvary; the fifth shews how the life of Christ procures salvation for his faithful followers; the third and sixth enter more fully into the Scripture doctrines of Ransom and Reconciliation. It would not be easy to choose out of so much that might be quoted to advantage; the reader will find his own study of this unassuming work amply rewarded. But we cannot leave it without remarking one happy distinction of Mr. Carpenter's lectures. They are rich in indications of a profound study and interpretation of human nature. The author is extremely ready and apt in illustrations like the following:

"Even in the world, it is the injurer whom it is most difficult to reconcile. When he who does the wrong keeps the bad feeling which led to the wrong, the consciousness of sin turns his animosity to hatred, and makes all advances to reconciliation difficult. The good man who is superior to insult, and can overcome evil with good, waits to be gracious to his insultor: but often waits in vain. He is ready to forgive, but the wrong-doer is not ready to be forgiven. When a child has disobeyed his parent and dreads his displeasure and dwells on his own trespass, his little heart is shrouded in sullen gloom: he feels alienated: he cannot believe that he is forgiven—he thinks that he does not wish to believe it. He shuns him whom he once so loved to meet. He cannot understand the depth of parental affection—how his father is waiting to be gracious to him—till the father by some proof of tenderness reveals his love and wins him back to himself. God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself. . . . . Without offers of pardon and spiritual help, how can the sinner return? They were given in the Old Testament: they proceeded from the lips of Jesus: they were manifested in his treatment of sinners: they were ratified when he died for sinners: and when God exalted him with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, it was 'to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins.'"—P. 141.

The first and the last of Mr. Porter's lectures present a clear and an admirable statement of the scriptural doctrine of reconciliation to the Father. The following passage will read in perfect harmony with the preceding quotation. It is from the concluding lecture.

"Above all, let us thankfully avail ourselves of the mercy which the Father sent the Son into the world to announce to all penitent offenders. Let us not be too proud to accept God's mercy, on God's own terms, as an act of his spontaneous and unpurchased grace. There are some whose language would lead us to suppose that they would think it beneath them to accept forgiveness and mercy unless they could establish a claim to it as due to them by divine justice; if not on account of their own merits, at least on the ground of another's merits as imputed to them! What mind is not shocked by such arrogance and ingratitude! Far be it from us. We feel our need of the proffered mercy; and with an humble and grateful acceptance of the terms on which it is offered, we fly for refuge from our sins and from ourselves to cast ourselves on the bosom of our Heavenly Father, and rush into the everlasting arms which are opened to embrace us."—P. 116.

The second and the seventh lectures record the history of the doctrine of Satisfaction to the times of Grotius, Butler, Magee and Price. The latter of these two lectures concludes with an admirable passage on the varieties of opinion among theologians, suggesting the duty of charity in all our labours in what we believe to be the sacred cause of truth. We must quote the final sentence.

"I confess it is to this silent, but powerful influence of the cross on the hearts of those who with faith and love contemplate it and him who bled upon it that I attribute much of the gentleness, meekness and self-sacrificing benevolence displayed by many of my fellow-christians whose

speculative opinions would appear to be calculated to inspire no feelings but those of stern and unrelenting harshness, but whose lives mark them out as among the purest and most amiable of mankind, the excellent of the earth."—P. 101.

Two lectures are devoted to the argument from Reason and from Scripture in support of the common doctrine, and two to the consideration of objections against it. It will be seen that the whole question is very fully treated. We do not think it needful in this place to follow the author in the examination of each particular. We remark only, that the arguments upon grounds of reason are very clearly and forcibly presented, independently of the reasoning from the Scriptures, which is not unworthy of Mr. Porter's reputation as a biblical scholar. We cordially recommend the work for circulation in our own congregations as well as amongst our orthodox connections. It is well fitted to accomplish the good purpose which has led to its publication.

THE PRINCIPLE OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.*

THOUGH not officially, this book is virtually, a manifesto on behalf of the late "Anti-State-Church Society," now calling itself the "Society for the Liberation of Religion from State Patronage and Control." That Society, chiefly consisting of *orthodox* Dissenters, arose and took up the question of religious liberty at a remarkable period, namely, when the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts and of the Catholic disabilities had been followed by the Dissenters' Chapels Act, which, though applying equally to all Dissenters, was immediately necessary for the protection of Unitarians. Till this time, the orthodox Dissenters were scarcely known in politico-religious action. All the above-mentioned concessions to religious freedom had been gained by liberal politicians and Unitarians, with little or no help from orthodox Dissenters, and the last two in the face of their general opposition. But from that time they felt themselves called upon to take up the cause of religious liberty. More had been done than they had approved, but less than they henceforth demanded. They now declared that the abstract principle of religious liberty had not been reached. The new and awkward word *voluntaryism* was coined to express the personal basis of religious profession; and the *Anti-State-Church Association* avowed by its name that the practical object to be

* The Ultimate Principle of Religious Liberty. The Philosophical Argument: with a Review of the Controversy as conducted on Grounds of Reason and Expediency in the Writings of Locke, Warburton, Paley, Dick, Wardlaw, Gladstone, Martineau and Miall. 8vo. Pp. 208. Ward and Co. 1860.

aimed at was neither more nor less than the abolition of the temporal power, wealth and status of the Established Church. It is not necessary to our present purpose to scrutinize the policy which soon dictated the change of that intelligible name for the less definite and very cumbrous title now borne by the Society. Suffice it that the Religious Liberation Society (as it is ambiguously called for brevity's sake) has found its chief sphere of action in perseveringly promoting petitions for the abolition of church-rates, thus practically acknowledging that the *principle* of religious liberty must be reached by detail, if reached at all.

The book before us is a somewhat ambitious attempt to find "the ultimate principle of religious liberty," as a something that has been hitherto missed by all the best seekers for it, from Locke to Edward Miall inclusive.

We shall state the writer's own view and compare it with Locke's (which is the common notion, but is thought to need amendment); and then, without following the author in his criticisms upon other defenders of Establishments, we may surprise and amuse our readers by his estimate of Mr. Martineau as *one of that number*, and also as a writer and thinker in general.

Locke had argued for restricting the civil magistrate to civil affairs, from such palpable reasons as the following: "Because the care of souls is not committed to the civil magistrate, any more than to other men." It is not committed by God; nor can it be vested in the magistrate by the people, because "no man can so far abandon the care of his own salvation as blindly to leave it to the choice of any other, whether prince or subject, to prescribe to him what faith or worship he shall embrace. For no man can, if he would, conform his faith to the dictates of another."

On this our author says:

"Locke seems to have approached very near to that which we conceive to be the primary ground of limitation; but he has failed, as we humbly conceive, to lay hold of it. The absence of authority in the magistrate we of course maintain; but we want the ground or *proof* of this assertion, and that from the reason of the thing; for it is on this basis that the question is here discussed by our philosopher. If asked for this proof on ulterior ground, we should answer, that religious authority and religious duty are antecedent to civil relations and institutions. They attach to the primary moral relations of man, and are therefore independent of and separate from the artificial and conventional relations of mere political citizenship. This is the order of nature —the ordination of God. The religious amenabilities exist anterior to civil government."—P. 27.

And our author in due time announces what he considers the "primary ground of limitation," in these oracular words (p. 36), which also appear on the title-page of the book as its motto:

"No authority can be possessed by any agency but such as is of the same nature with the relationship out of which it arises. No man can be placed in such a moral relationship to his fellow-men as is implied in a dominion over their religious conscience and practice. This, it appears to us, is the true ground of distinction between the different spheres of government in general, and also the foundation and true philosophy of religious liberty."—P. 36.

The want of clearness of expression is the first difficulty in the way of our accepting this alleged *principle*. The first sentence is indeed unintelligible. What is meant by "an agency possessing authority"? An agent might, but hardly an agency. Then do the words *such* and *it* refer to authority or to agency? or one to each? and if so, which to which? "No authority can be possessed by any agency but such [query, authority or agency?] as is of the same nature with the relationship out of which it [query, the authority or the agency?] arises." We confess we cannot make out the proposition designed to be conveyed in these words as a fundamental axiom. We think, but cannot be sure, that the author meant, "such *authority* as is of the same nature with the relationship out of which the *agency* arises." But what then is the meaning of an authority being of the same *nature* with a relationship? Is anything different meant from what Locke had said more simply when he argued that spiritual authority was *inappropriate* or *impossible* in the relationship held by the governor towards the governed? The second sentence just quoted indeed says this very thing: "No man can be placed in such a moral relationship to his fellow-men as is implied in a dominion over their religious conscience and practice." And if this proposition may not be taken as an axiom, we do not think the previous sentence will serve that purpose any better.

Our author is not more lucid in his further developement of his subject than in the statement of his axioms. In distinguishing the different *agencies* and authorities which arise out of different relationships, he actually maintains that the relation of the governor to the governed is *not a moral* relationship, and that it does not imply the enforcement of any moral duties as such! We can hardly persuade ourselves that a thoughtful man, in any degree versed in moral questions, can have deliberately penned the following words:

"Now since the *origin* of moral duty is found in a moral relationship, and since its obligation exists only in consequence of such relation subsisting, all *moral* duties, *as such*, are removed beyond the province of the civil ruler. Arising as they do out of natural and moral relationships, which the civil governor, as such, does not sustain towards the subject, their enforcement by the infliction of civil penalties must therefore be illegitimate."—P. 6.

What! are theft, fraud and murder, not violations of *moral*

duty? And is their control or punishment by civil inflictions illegitimate? Has the civil law of our own country no sanction in universal morals? Is not its strength found in so far as it is the reflection of the general conscience? And where it goes beyond or falls short of the dictates of the general conscience, is not the reform of our civil law for that reason demanded and in due time obtained? Is it not the boast of free institutions to make the law coincide with the general sense of right? Is it not the curse of despotism, and its danger, to defy the moral sentiment of the nation?

We do not fail to observe our author's saving clause, *as such*. He says, "All *moral* duties, *as such*, are removed beyond the province of the civil ruler." And when he further speaks of *civil* duties, he says their obligation "arises out of the relations of men *as members of the same political community*,—not as man to fellow-man, but as subject to fellow-subject. It is not a natural but a conventional relationship out of which this class of duties comes forth." And so, "what may be civil duties in one country or nation, may or may not be such in another" (p. 6).

Of course there are certain civil or political duties obligatory under a monarchy and not in a republic, and *vice versâ*. But those great matters of mutual right which are protected by the civil law of *all* nations, in the punishment of fraud, theft, murder, personal injury, &c.,—are these merely *civil* duties? or are they first moral, and therefore civil? Are the violations of these punished by the civil law because they are wrongs done from man to man, or from "members of the same political community" to each other? Do these belong to the "many acts civilly binding upon an Englishman, from which the subject of any other political government is exempt"? We trifle with morals and with law alike, to argue such questions.

Civil law has to do with morals and nothing but morals, yet not with the whole of morals. There are many parts of morality to which civil sanctions cannot reach. And there may be some matters of law on which the general sense of morals is in conflict, and the balance may ultimately be in favour of the existing law or against it. But to say that the "distinct *origins* of civil authority and of moral authority * * * separate the two and place the subjects of each beyond the jurisdiction of the other," is a new doctrine alike to ethics and jurisprudence. To say that, "springing from relationships quite distinct and essentially different, morals, whether viewed as comprehending religion or not, are wholly beyond the legitimate interference of civil authority," is to repudiate the whole course of civilized justice. Such writers as these give occasion to Mr. Martineau's sardonic remark, that "the strength of voluntaryism lies in the belief that the ends of Christianity are not moral ends."

Law does not comprehend the whole of morals. That is quite

true. What, then, is the limitation? is an important question; and the usual answer is that of Mr. Martineau in the article criticised by our author:

"The State is that system of organized agencies by which men in society may be led to comply with *such parts of the moral law* as are *within reach of public reward and punishment.*" (Church and State—Miscellanies, p. 160.)

Again, the same writer excellently says:

"Without attempting to draw any exact boundary around its proper realm—which must indeed vary with the historical conditions by which it is environed—it is clear that it (the State) can take cognizance only of *external actions susceptible of attestation;* that it cannot regulate acts of simple prudence and imprudence; that even of injuries, only those can be brought within its power which admit of *definition and of something like admeasurement both as to their intent and as to their effects.*"

Mr. Martineau indeed adds:

"Though, however, these limitations might be carried further, we altogether deny that they reduce the business of the State to the 'protection of body and goods.' We believe that a government which refuses to attempt more will soon be unable to accomplish this; and that when it *seems* to move with success within these narrow bounds, the order of which it boasts is bequeathed from an age when it aspired to nobler power, and is sustained by sentiments lingering from that better time." (Miscell. p. 159.)

Perhaps Mr. Martineau does not differ, except in words, from those who would restrain the business of the State to the "protection of body and goods," and in so doing would cultivate "the sentiments of the best times."

The practical statesman and the practical moralist are concerned to draw the line wisely and fairly where the State must cease to interpose its sanctions and leave the rest to conscience, to family, to society and (it may be) to the church. Nor is it difficult to draw this line so as to exclude theological interference. But our author does little service either to practical morality or practical statesmanship by endeavouring to "disprove the right of government in *morals and religion alike*" (p. 41), "and to shew that the magistrate *cannot practically* separate the moral from the religious for the purposes of a moral but not a religious administration" (p. 42). It has been the constant aim of the wisest jurists, moralists and anti-state-churchmen, to draw the line between legal morals and a State establishment of theology. And if for the common phrase, *State religion*, we could read *State theology* (which is always meant), the question would be contained in a nutshell. The State religion that is needed is that of Christian morals applied to civil and criminal law; the State theology that is to be deprecated is a very different matter. But our author only confuses the subject. He endeavours to "disprove the right of government in morals and religion alike," and

so to absolve himself from the "obligation to distinguish between the two" (p. 41); and he roundly declares that "the obligation of civil duties arises out of a conventional and not a natural or a moral relationship" (p. 6). He even says that the civil law does not punish theft as an offence against the moral law! These are his words:

"The moral law enjoins, Thou shalt not steal, and holds over its delinquent the retribution of Providence and eternity. The civil law says, If you appropriate the property of your fellow-citizen you shall be punished. Why does it punish? Because the moral law forbids theft? No such thing; but because the civil law itself (very likely in violation of the moral law) had made that piece of property the legal possession of another."—P. 190.

He must be a resolute theorist who can see no moral agency or authority in the consent of society to protect every one's property by the judicial punishment of the thief. Is not this consent of society the evident "retribution of Providence" upon the delinquent? The civil law punishes theft (says our author) because the civil law itself had made that piece of property the legal possession of another! But why had the civil law made it so, unless in obedience to the general sense of the moral rights of property? This question is disposed of in a random and most unworthy parenthesis which, if it means anything, means that the civil law of property violates the moral law as a general rule, and exists for the purpose of doing wrong.

In one instance our author has, we grant, caught Mr. Locke tripping in his principles of toleration; where that great philosopher denies toleration to the atheist on the ground that "promises, covenants and oaths, which are the bonds of human society, can have no hold upon him." But we do not see that this inconsistency "seriously vitiates and even maims the whole argument of Locke" (p. 43). It is an inconsistency and a shortcoming in the application of his fundamental principle, that "the commonwealth is a society of men constituted only for the procuring, preserving and advancing their own *civil interests*." But Locke makes the exception with a view to maintain his rule, because he thinks "promises, covenants and oaths can have no hold on the atheist." Locke does not say in what manner he would deny toleration to the atheist, and there is no need to think he meant active persecution, or anything beyond the loss of those privileges which attach to the morality of promises, covenants and oaths, from which he believes the atheist's principles to shut him out. Our author shews plainly that "society has no right to insist that the atheist should profess certain religious sanctions of good faith," but has a right to require and compel him "*to keep his word or agreement.*" And in this connection he maintains the uselessness and undesirableness of oaths, a conclusion which may be reached not only from their theore-

tical futility in the case of the atheist, but from the larger fact that the most religious witness is never in any court of justice believed because of his oath, but because his evidence is good and unimpeachable.

We have occupied more space perhaps than the merits of the book before us justify; but not more than is due to the subject, which our author has vainly endeavoured to place upon "what he deemed a more excellent platform of assault" (Preface, p. viii).

We need not pursue his review of other writers since Locke, in which he thanks Warburton for the undisguised worldliness of his theory of Church and State; laughs rather vulgarly at Paley's "sago spoon" and "argument made easy;" discusses more laboriously Gladstone's idea of the State having a personal conscience that requires a Church Establishment; and finds even his friends Dick and Miall falling something below his own "more excellent platform of assault."

But perhaps his most laboured review is the one devoted to Mr. Martineau, whose numerous friends and admirers among our readers may be curious to see what this ultra-voluntaryist of orthodoxy has to say of that remarkable man. An article on "Church and State" in the Prospective Review for May, 1845 (since republished in Mr. M.'s volume of Miscellanies), furnishes the groundwork of the criticism. We must gently protest against this article being regarded as in any sense "a manifesto of the views of that not very numerous but influential class of religious philosophers who are connected with the Unitarian churches." We do not think it is true of the Unitarians that "they do not on any other ground (than that of theology) object, *as a body*, to State support of religious institutions." The "free eclecticism" which, as our author declares, "prevails among this select and highly-cultivated class of thinkers," renders it difficult to make the estimate, and impossible to hold the body in general responsible for the views of any member, however eminent.

But has this writer correctly estimated Mr. Martineau's own position in the Church-and-State controversy? He describes him as "taking his place among the advocates of a State-supported religious institute" (p. 157). It is not by any means clear to us that this is the fact. Mr. M.'s paper on Church and State is purely theoretical, abstract and philosophical. We do not see that it is designed to touch at any practical point our concrete question of Church-of-Englandism. He shews "that the influences which we denominate by the word *Church* constitute no new element special to Christian nations;" but "were in truth comprised in the Hellenic idea of the *State;* which was not equivalent, as with us, to the mere aggregate of individual interests in respect to physical good, but represented all those moral ends which transcend personal happiness, and constitute the τελειότατον τέλος of human life" (Miscell. p. 107). Mr. Martineau's

essay is intirely hypothetical and abstract, and has no relation to any such vulgar question as the abolition of church-rates. Beginning with the Greek philosophical Utopias (not with the Greek commonwealths), he gives a "brief account of the disturbances which have interrupted the original partnership between the two elementary powers of society," and endeavours to collect "some augury as to their possible re-approximation" (p. 156). In doing this, he seems for a while to keep the Church and State distinct enough; the former being "that system of organized agencies by which men in society may be led towards compliance with *the whole moral law*, through *reverence*;" the latter, "that system of organized agencies by which men in society may be led to comply with *such parts of the moral law* as are *within* the reach of public reward and punishment" (p. 160).

When we had read thus far (and it is within two pages of the end of the essay), we confess we took Mr. M. for a pure voluntary of the first water. We admired his clear definitions of Church and State, and wanted nothing more to prove to us that they must be separate and distinct. *The whole moral law through reverence* defines the aim of the purest voluntaryism; *such parts as are within the reach of public reward or punishment*, is a good description of the legislator's and magistrate's province.

But Mr. Martineau himself spoils all at last, and leaves a perfect chaos, corresponding to that of the English question of Church and State:

"The State authorities may have the *right* to aid the Church; but suppose they cannot find it; that the national sources of reverence lie among the unorganized agencies, and have deserted the visible ecclesiastical system," &c. "What then is to be done? Can the right take effect? or, for want of the proper historical conditions, must it be inactive till better times? We shall not attempt to resolve these questions now; anxious, in tracing our path through the theory of polity, to admit no disturbances from the sceptic laugh and fanatic fears and party rage that confuse every entrance on its practice."—Pp. 161, 162.

Truly a "conclusion in which nothing is concluded"! We certainly do not conclude Mr. Martineau to be an advocate of the State Church of England, nor even of *a* State Church. We may indeed agree with our author that, "whether as listeners or as readers, we never met with a teacher whom we admired so much and who convinced us so little." We may agree with him that Mr. Martineau is not "his own equal in the analytic and synthetic powers of intellect:"

"Let him undertake the analysis and presentation of even the scarcely palpable conceptions of Coleridge, and we follow him with the assurance that a sympathetic spirit interprets to us the oracles of genius. But the moment we perceive the transition from the region of interpretive analysis to that of positive construction, we feel that we need a fresh guide and interpreter to assure us that we even apprehend, much more *accept*, the hypothesis." (Phil. Argum. p. 166.)

The essayist also says, not without some show of reason,—

"He may love philosophy much, but he loves mysticism more. As in the case of Mr. Gladstone, all the beautiful translucency of Mr. Martineau's style is frequently seen in the expression of those shadowy conceptions and sentiments habitual to an order of mind in which the poetic element prevails over the philosophical; and hence the luxuriant revelry of sentimental expatiation which, in spite of his critical scepticism, characterizes most of his productions."—P. 176.

In one respect, however, our essayist is quite mistaken in his estimate of Mr. Martineau. He lays all his sins, philosophical, æsthetic and political, upon an imagined all-engrossing bias to theology! It is quite amusing to see how he returns again and again upon his own ridiculous theory:

"Many passages in the writings of this singularly gifted and liberal-spirited man are sadly disfigured by the most virulently sectarian spirit." "From beginning to end theology rules the creed of Mr. Martineau in this matter." "We feel that that ugly enemy of all truth, Sectarian Prejudice, has been allowed to lead captive a noble-minded foeman." "In this essay, as in many of his other writings, there may frequently be caught a glimpse of the hoofs and horns of that vicious monster, Theological Bigotry."

Has the writer of these passages read Mr. Martineau's recent non-sectarian, non-theological, non-Unitarian pamphlets? Apart from these *extravaganzas*, it is simply absurd to represent Mr. Martineau as sectarian or theological. He is metaphysical, philosophical, abstract, perhaps visionary,—but not theological, not sectarian. Such an estimate is absurd.

There is more consistency in representing him as the advocate of personal religion and religious conviction, and reproaching him from this point of view with his supposed leaning to a State Establishment:

"Mr. Martineau, like the rest of us, starts off as a non-sectarian, non-theological theorist." "Here is the apostle of the essentially personal nature of sin and goodness, dreaming side by side with Mr. Gladstone in the interest of a nationally religious responsibility." "Yet with what terrible havoc does he play his artillery of denunciation against this very same principle, in the shape of subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles of the Established Church of England, under penalty of the forfeiture of its temporal advantages!"

And there may be some propriety in the following criticism, applicable to not a few other men of powerful and ready speech:

"His otherwise enviable talent of expression is attended with the usual drawback. In his case, language is so adroit and potent a faculty that we experience a mortifying disappointment on discovering, as not unfrequently happens, that, just at the critical point in the mental operation, it has ceased to act under control. No longer a passive instrument, but a power acting on its own account. The horse has run away with his rider. The dignity and power of self-possession are lost, and no air of ease and majesty assumed can deceive the practised observer."

GEORGE HARRIS: A MEMOIR.

Chapter V.

GLASGOW.

Mr. Harris commenced his ministry in Glasgow by conducting three services in Union-Street chapel, on Sunday, October 2, 1825. The text of his first sermon was Acts x. 29: "I ask, therefore, for what intent ye have sent for me?" The very next Sunday he delivered the first of a course of evening lectures on subjects relating to Christian doctrine, which was continued until the end of January, 1826. During the delivery of these lectures, the chapel was crowded to excess in every part, and some hundreds frequently went away from the doors, being unable to obtain admission. So great was the public interest excited by them, that their immediate re-delivery was requested, and they were repeated, on Sunday afternoons and evenings, from February 12 till the end of April. The chapel library was found quite inadequate to supply the demand for books which was made upon it in connection with these services; and the gratuitous distribution of large numbers of tracts was resorted to, in order to meet the desire for information which was so plainly manifested. While these efforts were being made to enlist public sympathy in favour of the cause of Unitarianism, other efforts were, with equal success, undertaken which had in view the internal improvement of the congregation. It was wisely considered that the best means of congregational prosperity would be afforded by mutual exertion for some common objects; and accordingly a Benevolent Society for the relief of the sick was instituted and a Sunday-school established. The former soon numbered nearly a hundred members, and the latter contained a hundred and sixty children. Each of these organizations was not only watched but conducted by Mr. Harris himself, inasmuch as he continually gave his personal assistance toward the carrying out of their business. Some years afterwards, in order that the Sunday-school might not fail, he took the entire management of it into his own hands, teaching therein from Sunday to Sunday, in addition to all his other arduous duties on that day. While thus engaged "in labours more abundant" at home, he shewed himself ready, by preaching and visiting, to seize every opportunity of promoting the spread of Unitarianism abroad. The missionary work which he did in this first year was of itself remarkable. Before the close of the year, too, he commenced the editorship of *The Christian Pioneer*, the possible existence and support of which in Scotland would alone prove the greatness of the change he had been able to produce. He had his reward in the result which the close of the year declared. Whereas the income of the chapel from all

ources could not previously have amounted to two hundred ounds per annum, the amount this year was swelled to four undred and thirty-six pounds. He thus became the master of is position, and was cheered by the congratulations and the oyful anticipations of his friends, who were deeply conscious hat what had been done was effected by his personal power mphatically. Considering the place and the time, a truly wonerful work had so far been wrought, and the author of it had he additional satisfaction of feeling that he had acted throughut it with the utmost disinterestedness. He had carried out is faith in the truth, "that it was more blessed to give than to eceive:" for of the large sum which he had been the means of ollecting only two hundred and twenty-five pounds fell to his hare. The rest was absorbed in the payment of the interest of heavy debt, and in the necessary expenses connected with the lace and mode of worship. Small as this stipend was in itself, e knew it to be great in proportion to the means of his congreation. Its value was immeasurably increased by the fact that hey were doing their utmost for his support in every way. It as a noble thing, that, burdened as they were, they should have ngaged, from the first, to give him more than their whole receipts t the time amounted to; and now, in exceeding that engagement, "the abundance of their joy and their deep poverty bounded unto the riches of their liberality."

The labour of this first year was but a specimen of the labours ith which all the succeeding years of his Glasgow ministry were lled. Nay, as the years went on, the calls to new labour on is part continually multiplied: and we find him ever ready to eet each fresh emergency with augmented vigour.

"What his reason and conscience dictated, that his will was strong nough to execute. The strength of his will was singularly proportioned o the extent of his insight into the sphere of Christian duty: so that, n the one side, he was not troubled by any vague fear of having misaken his path; and, on the other, was not tormented with remorse for aving undone the duty he knew. Herein, indeed, lay the secret of uch of his power. He walked earth with the strength of a man who n the morning knew what his day's work was, and felt himself capable f faithfully discharging it; and in the evening retired to rest having one what he intended."*

The general character and effect of his preaching at this time s thus described by Mr. M'Kean, in an account of his own conersion to Unitarianism with which I have been favoured:

"I went out one Sunday morning 'not knowing whither I ent.' On passing the Unitarian chapel, some months before, I ad heard the singing, accompanied by the organ, as I listened n the pavement outside, and I thought it very beautiful.

* Mr. Crosskey's Funeral Sermon.

Thitherward I bent my steps: and felt no danger, because, years before, I had, as I thought, beaten some of the best Unitarians in Paisley, in a written correspondence on religious matters. I entered the chapel and first noticed a number of children there. I pitied the poor little things because they could not judge for themselves: but I hardened my heart against the adults. I had heard that the minister was a great orator, and I put myself specially upon my guard. Shortly he entered the pulpit, and sat down for two or three minutes. When he rose, his fine, manly appearance won my favour. Surely, I thought, he can be no intentional deceiver. He read, in his deep tones, a sweet Sabbath hymn which was new to me, and the sentiment of it thrilled through my heart. I had determined to be a silent observer, but that became impossible. As I knew the tune well, I began to hum the bass, but in the last verse I brought out a ringing counter. The prayer was rather short according to my habits, but solemn, beautiful and glowing with benevolence. The reading of the lessons was superior to anything I had ever heard before, and the sermon was practical in its character and preached with calmness and dignity. I left the chapel imagining that Unitarianism might possibly not be the cold system of disbelief I had supposed it to be. What surprised me most was an intimation that the Lord's Supper would be celebrated the next Sunday. I wondered what business Unitarians could have with that ordinance, and I went again on that day to get at the secret. I was as delighted with the devotional services then as formerly. I resolved, however, to withdraw myself for a time from the chapel, for I feared Mr. Harris was carrying me off with him without due consideration on my part. But the charmer had got hold of me, and the next Sunday morning found me at the chapel once more. I did not pass unnoticed; for besides being a new man, it was observed that I always used a Greek Testament, and was diligent in turning to the quotations that were made. I was offered the use of books from the library, and I obtained thence the first Unitarian book I ever read. Books, however, did not stir me as did Mr. Harris's noble preaching. It was as scriptural as it was heart-stirring; and scripture had, all my life, been to me the court of final appeal. The authority of the Scriptures, indeed, underwent in my mind a great change. In place of submitting to all their words, I learnt to lay hold of their great principles: and by this means, I obtained, through the Scriptures, I feel solemnly assured, a more spiritual faith, a more intelligible theology, and a more heartfelt religion. The Scotch must have the Bible, and indeed the common people everywhere must; and no man ever made a better use of it than did our departed friend.

"He had no sympathy with those who generalized doctrines, and supposed one to be as good as another; but he felt it his

duty to establish a church whose fundamental principle was the Fatherhood of God, which, however uncompromisingly adverse it might be to party doctrines involving partial salvation, was in charity with men of every creed and colour and country. Another element of the great success of Mr. Harris's preaching was his strong faith in his principles. The fashion of the world might pass away, but he believed they could not. He had consequently a definite message to deliver, a distinct gospel to preach. He had no doubt as to what he was to declare, and no double meaning in declaring it. He was singularly clear in his statements, so that the people could 'search the Scriptures and see whether the things were so.' Not only was he a firm believer in the truth he professed, but he also relied upon its suitableness for the deliverance of the world from sin and its advancement in holiness. He deliberately thought that no other form of faith could undermine the tyrannies of the world, destroy the institution of slavery, make an end of war, and realize the visions of prophets and holy men of old: but that under the influence of Unitarian Christianity, the ignorance and error, the degradation and demoralization, the craft and cruelty, which had laid waste the divine nature of whole populations, would gradually decline and die, and go into utter annihilation. Hence proceeded his missionary spirit: and his powerful attacks upon Calvinism, the prevailing and terrifying delusion of his day, were dictated by a pure benevolence. The exposure of religious error was one form in which his spirit girt itself to do battle for humanity. His religion was no abstraction, but, as he apprehended it, a power of God unto salvation, competent to deliver the whole creation from the bondage of corruption.

"Year after year his chapel was filled to overflowing with quiet and attentive hearers, all of whom, in Scotch fashion, had the psalms and hymns of the Kirk in their pockets: and when, at those evening services, Mr. Harris, as he was accustomed to do, employed the book of paraphrases, what glorious bursts of sound followed up the efforts of his eloquence! The organ was drowned, though its whole power was put on, by the hearty response of the crowded congregation. Never again shall I enjoy such rapture till I get to heaven, and join the vast multitude which no man can number."

In the spring and summer there were two services, morning and afternoon, held every Sunday; and, throughout the autumn and winter months, a third service was generally added in the evening. The morning and afternoon services were chiefly devoted to the edification of the regular congregation, and the evening service was almost always directed to the exposure of some popular error or the advocacy of some controverted truth, as truth and error were estimated by the preacher. His choice of subjects was invariably an expression of his strong faith that the

true happiness of man was permanently centred in the conversion of the world to the worship and service of God as the universal Father. There was, I understand from various sources, a marked difference between the manner in which the evening services were conducted and that which distinguished the services in the former part of the day. The morning service was quiet, sensible, serious, and gone through with dignity and solemnity, but without any strong emotion. In the evening the orator and declaimer came forth. The same unimpassioned method as before prevailed in the introductory proceedings—clear and impressive, and adapted to restrain rather than to encourage excited feeling. But when the ice was broken in the sermon, the eye began to kindle and the voice to assume the variations and modulated intonations of the splendid organ that it was. There was a frequent thrusting forth of the arm, and occasionally—but very occasionally—the arm would be uplifted and the hand descend. The very most was made of the matter that could be made of it. In the midst of violent storms of indignation, gleams of the sweetest sunshine would break forth, and tender showers of the softest pathos would vary the scene. The quarterly sacramental services were of another character still,—most beautiful and touching in their accommodation to a deeper tone of sentiment than was elsewhere expressed. "You can scarcely," says Mr. George Hope, "praise Mr. Harris's eloquence too much. His serious and earnest manner, his command over his fine voice, whether raised in denunciation of wrong or lowered to earnest and affectionate pleading, entirely carried his audience with him. His greatest power lay in his direct appeals to the best feelings and instincts of our common humanity, making men know within themselves that he spoke the truth."

The pastoral duties of his situation were discharged by this popular preacher with the same zeal and assiduity with which his pulpit work was performed. He knew all his people intimately, and was ever ready to give counsel and assistance to all, whatever the nature of their exigencies might be. He would in bad weather gird himself up to a weary day's work of begging for a poor family of his flock that had fallen into distress.

To the students in the Glasgow University with whom he could form a connection, and especially to that class of them who passed through the University as Dr. Williams's bursars, he was especially kind and attentive. He took an interest in all their affairs. He treated them with a genial hospitality. He encouraged them in their labours, and manifested the greatest pleasure in their success. He did whatever he could to attach them to the services of his chapel, and called forth their talents for the ministry to which they were destined by employing them in preaching and teaching as opportunities offered. During the sixteen years' continuance of his Glasgow ministry, a considerable

number of these students were brought into intimate relations with him. Many of them have since occupied, and still occupy, influential positions as English Unitarian ministers; and their obligations to him are not by any means confined to what he did for them when they were placed under his immediate notice, but extend to the beneficial effect which his intercourse with them had upon their future professional course. I can trace that effect more or less in the instances of this kind with which I am personally acquainted, and that always in some specially characteristic form.

The pecuniary difficulties with which the Glasgow congregation had to contend cannot be passed over in silence. In the year 1828, Mr. Harris undertook an English journey to collect subscriptions toward paying off the debt with which the chapel was burdened. He travelled nearly two thousand miles, and obtained a sum of six hundred pounds. Still the debt continued to be very oppressive; and yet, in 1834, the chapel was enlarged at an expense of between two and three hundred pounds, which was raised by the congregation alone; and in 1835, a purse of one hundred guineas was presented by them to their pastor. This last act of generosity cannot be mentioned without connecting it with a similar act on the part of the pastor toward his flock. In the year 1838, in consequence of some money losses among those attached to him, he voluntarily gave up £30 of his inadequate salary. The liberal and self-sacrificing spirit which thus shewed itself could not, however, avail to remove the financial embarrassment. The whole of Mr. Harris's active ministry was troubled and fettered by responsibilities which had been contracted at the first erection of the chapel. He had to renew his applications to friends at a distance for aid from time to time, and to repeat his journeyings from place to place, in order to collect with his own hand the money that was needed. One cannot but think that this ought not so to have been. That this people, tried with fire as they were in every other way, should have been left to struggle with this particular evil, which the wealthier churches that were "at rest" in the South could so easily have swept away, is still to be lamented. What was done under these disadvantages we know, but we cannot estimate how much was obliged to be left undone. The evil still exists. The Glasgow congregation has at the present time to do battle against a debt which it has inherited from the foundation of its interest. The removal of this debt would, I have reason to believe, raise that congregation to a state of efficiency as to its resources with which few Unitarian congregations could compare; and if, by means of such facts as those before us, a sense of the duty devolving upon us as Christians to help forward the work of Christian truth and freedom wheresoever the help is wanted should be more deeply experienced, we ourselves shall profit by it beyond

any benefit we may confer upon others: "For the administration of this service not only supplieth the wants of the saints, but is abundant also by many thanksgivings to God."

One marked fact connected with the Glasgow congregation was its fluctuating character. It never consisted of the same persons for any length of time, and the multitude of persons who may be said to have passed through it was very great indeed. At every evening service there were scores of strangers present, many of whom, though they first came from curiosity, afterwards habitually came from choice. The attendance of these parties was, however, frequently discontinued. In this respect the congregation differed as widely as possible from the mass of English Unitarian congregations, which have been distinguished for their want of change. Indeed, the difference relates not to Unitarianism in Glasgow only, but to Scotch Unitarianism generally. It would, I think, be wrong to attribute this fluctuation to any inaptitude or deficiency in the ministry. There were plainer causes for it than that; and these other causes operated more strongly in proportion as the administration was more attractive. The greater the numbers drawn together by the extraordinary power of the preacher, the greater was likely to be the defalcation when ordinary influences exerted their normal effect. "The fear of the folk," which is scarcely felt amid the excitement of a new enthusiasm, falls upon the heart with a heavier weight when, in the usual course of things, the enthusiasm passes away. A theological controversy may for a time supply energy and zeal to its eager partizans; but it is religious cultivation, not theological ardour, which must keep a man steady in his church associations, and the controversialist may become alienated in spirit from religion by the very vigour of the opposition he conducts. The attraction of Mr. Harris's eloquence was most powerfully felt by young men not settled in life, who, when they afterwards married and thus came under stronger social influences, yielded to the increased temptation to escape from the discomfort of their heretical position. Great numbers of the persons who joined the Union-Street congregation did not remain in Glasgow, but became scattered through the world. The young men who adopted the Unitarian faith were energetic beyond the average. Such men, in Scotland, very often either emigrate to foreign countries or remove to the large cities of England, and thus the superiority of the element engaged increased the danger of its being withdrawn from this particular use. Still, when we look beyond the immediate interest of the chapel itself, such circumstances as I have just alluded to give us a more important view of the benefits arising from Mr. Harris's ministry than the mere establishment of a settled congregation could afford. No man could remain under that ministry even for a few months without gaining a certain amount of education in liberal principles which would

affect the tenor of his whole future life and modify all his relations with others. He would neither be the same man himself, nor would his conduct in the world produce the same result, as would have been the case had he been destitute of this training. I should imagine very few of these persons really went back to the belief of orthodoxy. Though many of them may now be members of orthodox churches, they have carried wherever they have gone a spirit that has in some measure counteracted the prejudice and bigotry of the associations into which they were thrown. No one can estimate the amount of influence which has been exerted in the manner I have endeavoured to describe. Traces of it are continually to be observed, under the most unexpected circumstances, in Scotch society, and it must have very widely operated in all parts of the globe. It should be remembered that what good has been thus done mainly arose from the popular form in which Mr. Harris set forth his doctrines, and the oratorical reputation which he was able to establish in their favour. His fame as a speaker to whom it was a delight to listen, had its disadvantages in relation to the cause he advocated, but it had eminent advantages which nothing else could have produced. The crowd on which he acted had afterwards to be winnowed; but to collect that crowd and to sow the seed broadcast among it was the right method of commencing the work by which the children of the kingdom might be made to spring up and bring forth fruit on the field of the world.

The controversies in which Mr. Harris was engaged while he remained in Glasgow were strikingly descriptive of the relation he sustained to the religious public by whom he was encompassed. He was excluded from all Christian association, and not permitted freely and according to his station to unite in the promotion of objects of general utility to which he was attached. He had to protest against the intolerance of one minister who refused to meet him at a funeral where he was expected to officiate, saying, "I cannot attend: I cannot say Amen to Mr. Harris's prayers." He had to reprove another minister for announcing as the subject of a lecture, "Unitarian Morality as much opposed to Christian Morality as is the Doctrine of Christ to the Doctrine of Devils." He had to expose the shameless conduct of a newspaper editor who had inserted in his journal, under the head of Cross Readings—"On sabbath evening last, an eloquent discourse was preached in the Unitarian chapel by the Rev. George Harris to a crowded——assemblage of pickpockets, prostitutes and other disorderly characters who frequent the place." He had to complain of the conduct of various individuals, both private and official, who interfered to prevent him from occupying public rooms which he had hired or was about to hire for the purpose of his religious services. He had to remonstrate with the conductors of a Tract Society who pub-

lished in their Report a very injurious statement concerning him, but who refused to give up the name of the author of the statement or the names of the parties concerned in it. He had to direct attention to the proceedings of a Glasgow Presbytery which sanctioned the decision of a church session, to the effect that one of its members "should be censured and admonished for having on several occasions, and particularly on the evening of a communion sabbath, left his own church and worshiped in the Rev. George Harris's Unitarian chapel." He had to plead against the injustice of the Glasgow Bible Society, which formally excluded "all who do not profess the Protestant faith and a belief in the Holy Trinity from holding office in the Society." He had to vindicate his Unitarianism against representations of its evil tendency which were grounded upon the fact that a poor murderer under sentence of death expressed a wish to see him. On all these occasions of defence he gave to the local circumstances which called for his interference an application bearing upon some general principles of truth and righteousness; and there were other occasions on which the discussion of such principles formed the direct purpose of his efforts in opposition to others; but no one can look over such topics as I have enumerated, and which do not by any means exhaust the list of matters of the same kind I could bring forward, and not see that the main stress of controversy with which he had now to do related not to the legitimate statement of any difference of opinion, but to the perpetration of social wrongs inflicted under the shelter of that difference. When this state of things is vividly called to mind, it confers a heroism upon the man who passed through the trial so courageously and cheerfully—nay, with such a hopeful pride—as we know this man to have done. There he stood, year after year, amid a hard, harsh, alienated and hostile community, all the respectable people looking on him with scorn, shunned and avoided, misrepresented and vilified by the multitude, shut out from the common interests of society, expecting to encounter a fresh foe at every turn of affairs,—but self-poised and independent, a brave exile from another and more friendly land, who had voluntarily separated himself to the work of his ministry that he might thus the better confess Christ before men.

While thus standing alone, Mr. Harris did not by any means neglect to forward by his own personal exertions every social or civil object which answered to his views of human liberty and progress. He introduced questions of this kind into *The Christian Pioneer*, as freely as he did questions that were distinctively religious: and he pressed them upon public attention by means of pamphlets and lectures and sermons. At a very early period of his settlement, he projected a petition against the Test and Corporation Acts, which in ten days received three thousand,

eight hundred and seventy signatures. He preached and published a sermon explanatory of his reasons for not observing the National Fast which was commanded in 1832. He celebrated the passing of the Reform Bill by a thanksgiving discourse on the subject of universal liberty. He took every opportunity of denouncing and opposing slavery, whether existing under English or American rule. He attached himself strongly to the Temperance movement, and became a teetotaller, not because he needed or preferred such abstinence on his own account, but because he thought it strengthened his moral influence. He promoted the cause of national education, though he was not permitted even to speak at a social meeting which was held after the delivery by James Simpson of a course of lectures on that subject. It was objected, by a person to whom the intention of asking Mr. Harris to speak was mentioned, that such a proposal could not be entertained; for that a gentleman who had purchased three tickets for Mr. Simpson's lectures, on seeing Mr. Harris present, went home and burned them all; and that another individual, observing Mr. Harris nod approbation to some of Mr. Simpson's statements, resolved he would hear no more, and did not return again. He never shrank from supporting and defending religious voluntaryism and exposing the evils of a Church Establishment, although he had to suffer more from the bigotry of the professed voluntaries of Glasgow than from the adherents of the Kirk, and was shunned by them in their professed endeavours to promote the voluntary cause as one of whose aid they were ashamed. He upheld the true principles of religious liberty against Protestant dogmatism and exclusion by celebrating the Tricentenary of the Reformation in sympathy with the Church of Geneva; and he watched over those principles continually, pointing out, from time to time, the violations of them which were committed by the churches around him, whether they affected his own opinions or not. He exerted himself most strenuously against capital punishment. His lectures on that subject excited throughout Scotland the greatest interest. They were delivered in Glasgow three several times within six months. They were delivered twice in Edinburgh and twice in Aberdeen, and also in Paisley, Falkirk, Kilmarnock, Tillicoultry, Bonhill, Kirkintillock, Campsie, Bridgeton, Johnstone and Dalry. Sometimes their delivery took place in churches, and it was frequently requested by associated bodies of persons as well as by large numbers of scattered individuals. Religious prejudice was in a great measure put on one side in connection with this particular movement, but it occasionally manifested itself decidedly enough even here. When the Rev. Patrick Brewster, for instance, one of the ministers of the Abbey, Paisley, who was notorious as a political and social reformer, was asked to sign a requisition from the inhabitants of Paisley to Mr. Harris, asking him to deliver

three lectures there, he declined to do so on the declared ground that, though he agreed with Mr. Harris in the principles of the lectures, he considered him "a very dangerous man."

But the most remarkable manifestation of a public kind, unconnected with the promotion of his religious views, which he made, related to what was called the Rathcormac Massacre. This massacre involved the slaughter of nine persons and the wounding of eight others in an attempt to execute a distraint for tithe by military force. The military were accompanied by the Rev. W. Ryder, the Archdeacon of Cloyne, to whom the payment of the tithe was due. The person on whom the demand was made was a widow of the name of Ryan, and among the victims of the slaughter was her own son. The case excited at the time of its occurrence the strongest feelings of indignation and horror, and was justly considered as a legitimate testimony to the shocking character of the administration of ecclesiastical affairs in Ireland. On Sunday morning, January 18, 1835, Mr. Harris preached a sermon on the subject of this event. At the request of his hearers, it was preached again to a very large and deeply attentive congregation on the evening of the same day. He engaged to repeat it the next Sunday afternoon, provided a collection was made for the families of those who were shot on the melancholy occasion that called it forth. It was listened to the third time by as large an audience as could possibly be contained within the walls of the building. Many hundreds could not get in, and before the worship began, a notice had to be posted on the chapel to the effect that the sermon would be repeated for the fourth time the same evening. It was immediately published, and in the space of one week four large editions of it were called for. The copy now lying before me has "nineteenth edition" on its title-page.

This discourse was singularly well adapted to its purpose, and full of the power which a direct statement of a very strong case exerts. There is in it no beating about the bush. It comes right home to the points aimed at, and lays bare with a stroke the feeling it desires to touch. It is remarkably free from mere sentimentalism or any attempt at high-flown description. The native interest of the subject is increased by this unaffected treatment of it. As might be inferred from the text, to which I have alluded in a former chapter, the sermon mainly consists of a parallel between the conduct of our Saviour toward the widow of Nain and the conduct of this minister of his religion toward the Rathcormac widow; and the parallel is made to illustrate the contrast between "Christianity and Church-of-Irelandism:"

"The ecclesiastical dignitary did visit the widow indeed, but it was to leave her more afflicted than he found her. The plague-spot of mammon was on him when he went: the blood of the widow's son besmeared his sacerdotal garment on his return. . . . . The visit of Jesus

was a visit of mercy—that of his professed servant was an errand of rigour. Many of his disciples went with Jesus and much people—a hired soldiery armed with the death-weapons followed the ecclesiastic. Death had occurred ere Jesus drew nigh to the city: death was the result of the approach of his professed follower. When the Lord saw her of Nain, he had compassion on her: when the self-styled minister of Jesus saw the widow who was his debtor, he forgot the Christian in the creditor. . . . . But marvel not at the contrast. It is between an Archdeacon of the Established Church of Ireland and the Saviour of the world."*

The transaction under notice very much increased Mr. Harris's popularity and extended his influence. On a visit he paid to Ireland during the year in which the sermon was published, he was received with a kind of triumph. Resolutions of thanks to him for it were voted by various bodies in different parts of the three kingdoms. He was threatened with prosecution—it was said government prosecution—but the threat only called forth ample offers of support. Daniel O'Connell declared his willingness to plead his cause if the prosecution should take place, and as a practical evidence of sympathy the Liberator gave a subscription to the Glasgow Unitarian chapel. Bishop Murdoch, the Roman Catholic prelate of Glasgow, also subscribed to the testimonial which has been before referred to as having been presented to Mr. Harris. "Never," said he, "did I give a subscription so cheerfully as this. I give it not as to the Unitarian minister, but to the advocate of Catholic emancipation — the friend of the injured and oppressed—the preacher of pure morality—and who exhibits in his life the morality he inculcates."

I must here, somewhat abruptly, close the present chapter. I have only endeavoured in it to describe Mr. Harris's Glasgow course in relation to those matters which were identified with or immediately sprung out of his connection with Glasgow itself. There is another phase of his ministry which remains to be noticed—that embraced by the efforts he made to spread Unitarianism in Scotland beyond the circle of Glasgow means and opportunities. What I have to say on that topic must be reserved for the next chapter.

WHAT ATHENS HAS DONE FOR REASON AND LIBERTY.

All the triumphs of truth and genius over prejudice and power, in every country and in every age, have been the triumphs of Athens. Wherever a few great minds have made a stand against violence and fraud, in the cause of liberty and reason, there has been her spirit in the midst of them, inspiring, encouraging, consoling; by the lonely lamp of Erasmus; by the restless bed of Pascal; in the tribune of Mirabeau; in the cell of Galileo; on the scaffold of Sidney.—*Lord Macaulay.*

* Christianity and Church-of-Irelandism, pp. 14, 15.

TWO UNPUBLISHED LETTERS OR PETITIONS OF PAUL BEST, THE UNITARIAN CONFESSOR.

In a former volume of the Christian Reformer (IX. 493—503), we gave a memoir of Paul Best and of his remarkable pamphlet entitled "Mysteries Discovered." During his tedious imprisonment in the Gatehouse, he addressed two letters to Lenthall, the Speaker, the originals of which we recently met with in the invaluable MS. collections of Bishop Tanner.

The first letter, thus described in the Index, is to be found in Vol. lix. p. 525: "Paul Best, prisoner in the Gatehouse—letter to Lenthall, begging for a day of hearing, to vindicate himself from the charge of blasphemy, Sept. 5, 1646."

Right worthie and worshipful Sir,—May it please you, in regard of my long and close imprisonment in this place ever since the beginning of July, 1645, to reflect upon that of Deut. xxv. 3, not to exceed in punishing, but as a good and gracious Christian, as Pet. iii. 8, to shewe yourselfe pittiful and courteous in expediting a time for me to answere whatsoever can be objected against my cause in vindicating that firste and greate commandment, and cleareing the heavenlie Trinity of all Romish and Popish ——— and innovation (?); and that you would be pleased to put the hon. House in minde of a hearing for me, being driven to a greater exigent (?). I hope by this they have leisure to thinke upon the libertie of their distressed liege and loving subject and servant. Thus, in presumption of your worship's worthe and candour, I make bolde to trouble, if not abuse, your patience, which I humbly desire you to pardon; so I shall remain,

A most observant servant of your worthe and worship,

PAUL BEST.

From the Gatehouse in Westminster, Sept. 5, 1646.

To his truely honoured William Lenthall, Esq., Speaker. This with my humble service present.

Endorsed—Paul Best's letter, Sept. 5, 1646. Bundle 4th, from Sept. till Dec. 1646.

The second letter (Vol. lviii. p. 224) is described in the Index, "Petition of the same to the same effect, June *(January?)* 21, 1647."

Hon. Sir,—Whereas your petitioner having formerly had experience of your worthe and understanding when he was called to the bar before your hon. House,—according to his writings he did not deny the matter of the heavenlie Trinitie according to holy Scripture; but for the manner (according to Athanasius his simbole in that abolished liturgie) that it is a Popish doctrine or Romish tradition, and masse of contradictions concerning God and Christ Jesus our blessed Saviour. Alsoe there being an ordinance of Parliament thereupon, viz., that the terme Person being no where in Scripture applied to God, nor yet used in the Church of 300 and more yeares after Christ, that no persone should be mulcted for his doctrine in that kind; notwithstanding, your petitioner hath continued in prison ever since; which obstruction of justice your petitioner supposes to be made by the clandestine suggestions and procure-

ment of his antagonists, by reason whereof the detriment and losse of legal libertie, which doth not only redound to your distressed petitioner, but reflect upon your Honour.

Your poor suppliant being in prison, without hope of other help, presumeth so far upon your Honour's patient goodness, that your hon. House may be moved as your discretion shall direct, whereby he may either have a speedy trial, or that bayle may be taken until such time as the hon. House shall be pleased to appoint a determinate hearinge.

And your petitioner shall pray ever. By mee,

PAUL BEST.

To the Hon. William Lenthall, Esquire, Speaker to the hon. House of Commons in Parliament at Westminster, these with his service present.

Endorsed—Paul Best, xxi Jan. 1647.

It appears from the Journals of the House of Commons that Best was released from his imprisonment, July 1, 1647.

CORRESPONDENCE.

A TRINITARIAN'S RELIGIOUS DEBTS TO UNITARIANISM.

SIR,

WILL you allow me a page or two of your Magazine wherein to express my deep sympathy, as a Trinitarian, with the witness and the protest borne by the Unitarian church against that *spurious* Evangelicalism which pretends to the right of exclusive dominion over the Trinitarian churches? When I speak of Evangelicalism, I mean that theology represented by the "Record" newspaper,—not certainly the holy and simple "Evangelicalism" of men like John Wesley and Dr. Chalmers. I do not write this letter that I may have an opportunity of party denunciation; quiet and modest "witness to the truth" is what one should aim to render, and that alone. For mere denunciation is ever an unblessed thing, born of hatred and pharisaism.

Such witness, I think, Unitarianism has borne. To me, and to thousands more, your church has opened up one avenue toward the light out from among the black shadows of theological anathema and hatred. It helps one's thought to deliver itself from the cold and dark entanglements of dogmas whose strength lies in their threatenings, and to reach the presence of him whom we call the Saviour of the world. I owe in part to the spiritual power of some Unitarian writings of this age my deliverance from idolatry of the dead Christ of Bibliolatry; and greatly to it also my insight into that which Bibliolatry keeps entirely in the background, the humanity of Christ. Those writings will do much to give back to the church his name of "the Son of Man:" and to me, as I am sure to hundreds of other Trinitarians, their thoughts and aspirations never cease to mingle with the vision of Christ's sacred life, and to guide by his spirit of loving and forgiving humanity.—I hope this may not seem a forward manner of offering my single witness to the debt which pure and living Trinitarianism owes to the sister creed.

The Unitarian doctrine of Jesus Christ does seem *to me* most certainly defective,—heretical I dare not call it; for heresy is that which mingles the light of Christ with the darkness of party hatred, and must be charged quite as much against the so-called "orthodox," as against the so-called "heterodox" part of the spiritual world. If imperfection and one-sidedness of theological view be heresy, we are all heretics; and little children are *not* of the heavenly kingdom. But, for myself, I believe intensely and reverently that Jesus is the Son of God, who was with God from everlasting. And if one really believe *this* doctrine, how dare he cast a stone at any honest man as *a heretic?* for ought he not to remember that God has now visibly crowned humanity with his own divine glory, and that henceforth to him every true man is a new revelation of God's holiness and beauty? For me to believe, to trust that Jesus is the Eternal One, is to learn that man is no more bound by the darkness and littleness of "the flesh," but is transfigured with him to the likeness of those angels of humanity which "in heaven do always behold the face of his Father who is in heaven." Oh, awful hypocrisy, that any man can set himself above his brother-men because he has assumed the name of that Saviour of man who "is meek and lowly in heart." As I think of it, the only Trinitarian faith in the least worthy to be called "faith in the Son of God" and in his eternal Spirit, is a moral belief and trust that will breathe on the heart and around the life of the disciple, Christ's own love and forgiveness of man; that will transfigure the world to his vision, revealing to him that the true and the unselfish among men are become the children of a Heavenly Father and members of a family whose true home is in heaven—helping him to see the selfish and the untrue as in the light of God's boundless love and pity, and of a Saviour's holy tears—and teaching him to regard as his lasting enemies only the hateful and the devilish. Oh, if our Master were to come again and visibly walk in the midst of his churches, *who* would hear his "Woe to you," and who his "Blessed are ye"? Would the anathematizers of the late beloved Mr. Robertson be called to share his holy solitudes, and perchance their leader to lean upon his bosom? Would he *assert* in dogma his Deity, and refuse his blessed name to the meek and noble and true who deny it? Would he not, as of old, preach his name the Son of God, the way and the truth and the life to men because he doeth eternally and perfectly THE FATHER'S will? Would he who said he was "meek and lowly in heart," smile on those who think it *their* calling to tell to *every* man* in proud dogma his Deity, and to refuse his name (if *they* could do it) to all who deny the doctrine, however they may love and serve *him?* The meek alone, as of old, would he bless.

I believe that the Trinitarian church owes to its sister church a vast debt for the witness it has borne against *its own heresies of spurious orthodoxy*. For who are antichrist but they that deny the Father and the Son? And have not they so denied who loudly claim the name of Christ, and yet disbelieve that God *really* loves the whole world and will never change his love into damnatory hatred toward men, that he hates *only* the great enemy of man and all who blaspheme their holy humanity and become the children of that enemy? They may hold the dogma that

* "Then charged he his disciples that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ."

one whom they *call* Christ is God, but as yet they have not believed *in God*, for God is Love. They worship idols of creed; they have not yet seen, neither known, the loving, merciful Jesus. The Unitarian church has often preached the doctrine of the Son of Man against the doctrines of *arbitrary* damnation so often proclaimed *by antichrist* in the so-called "orthodox" church. Not that *I* dare to fix the name of antichrist on any one preacher or class of preachers. But it may be, for aught I know, that St. John would call those doctrines a blasphemy of the Beast. God be praised that one section of Christ's church has for long centuries borne a steadfast and (I suppose) almost an unanimous witness against the theological lie that He, our Father, will ever destroy any of his human children!

I shall ever hold it a sacred privilege that I may join in the worship of the Unitarian church, equally as in the worship of that church which keeps what I think the perfect creed. Among my most delightful recollections are those of some few Unitarian sermons, which seemed to me to breathe more of Christ's fire, and to incite more to Christian reflection, than any sermons I remember to have heard in these somewhat cold Scottish Calvinistic churches. And to join in the simple and solemn worship of the Unitarians,—so beautifully expressed in Mr. Martineau's Hymn-book,—is to me a blessed thing.

I have taken liberty to speak my thoughts and feelings with some seeming egotism, for I meant to sign myself only as

A Brother-christian.

Edinburgh, Sept. 12, 1860.

ON NATURAL DEPRAVITY.

Sir,

In reply to your correspondent *Fides*, I fear that my former communication on this subject was not so clearly stated as to be fully understood. And now, in briefly re-stating it in a different way, I shall venture to assume that he will admit that there is and can be but one infinite Being, and consequently that all other beings must be finite. This being admitted, it follows that the Infinite could not make a being equal to himself; that all created beings can have only finite and limited attributes, with the consequent liability to fall into error; and which liability, conjoined with the principle of self-love, naturally degenerates into what we mean by selfishness, which is the germ of all moral evil or sin against both God and man; i.e. against God, because it tends to violate the divine law as inscribed on the human conscience; and against man, because it tends to invade the rights of fellow-beings.

In reply to this hypothesis, *Fides* objects, that "this is simply to say that God was necessitated to make human nature impure and inclining to sin, so that the Omnipotent had to submit to necessity; which is a contradiction."

Here I join issue with him by denying that it is any contradiction; but, on the contrary, that as it is admitted that God could not make an

equal, and therefore, if He chose to create intelligent beings, they must necessarily be finite and fallible, it would be a contradiction to say that He could create otherwise; and therefore, as all created beings must be liable to error from the limited nature of their endowments, it follows that moral evil is the inevitable consequence of creation itself; for as God chose to create intelligent beings, and could not endow them with infinite attributes, He took on himself the consequences of the act of their creation.

Now I admit that to make God, in even the remotest way, the author of evil is very repugnant to our feelings; but when enlightened and far-seeing faith shews that God has made evil subservient to the production of good, just as medicine is in the hand of the skilful physician, and that apparently the good could not be produced without the agency of the evil in such a constituted being as man, the religious mind sees that evil is a necessary part of the Divine government, and founded in wisdom and goodness as well as in necessity; and that whilst the principle of sensation, developed into self-love, and that into selfishness, generates moral evil, it also serves as a check upon it by means of the pain and punishment, either felt or feared, consequent on the violation of the moral sense. And here we have perpetually "ill educing good."

I do not say that this hypothesis is free from all difficulty; but is there less difficulty in the opposite scheme? For is the *permission* of evil in an Infinite Being, having power to prevent its existence, a less difficulty than the direct agency of that power in compounding evil with the constitution of man as an inevitable condition of the general scheme of human creation? For surely, if God could have prevented the introduction of evil in the constitution of man, his goodness is compromised in not having done so; because in such case He is supposed to have had the power, but not the will to do so.

Is not the Divine foreknowledge the same in effect with the Divine ordination? for must not an event foreseen be fixed and certain? for how otherwise could it be foreseen?

It is childish as well as impious to suppose, as some have done, in order to avoid the force of this dilemma, that God's omnipotence drew a veil over his prescience when the germ of evil was introduced at creation; in other words, that God blindfolded himself on that occasion; and that He was afterwards surprised and displeased to find that evil existed, contrary to his foreknowledge or design; for assuredly whatever He did in forming man, He designed to do, and perfectly foresaw every possible effect of his work.

A theologian of some notoriety at one time in our body, Mr. Barker, seeing the puerility of thus setting one divine attribute at war with another, took the bolder and more consistent course of totally denying the Divine foreknowledge, in order to conserve the independency of man. Is *Fides* prepared to make that awful and impious denial also? I believe not, as he appears to have too religious a mind to do so. And what then is left him but to admit the supremacy of God's prescience and providence, even though the dignity of man should be somewhat lowered thereby?

What do we mean by the providence of God? Is it an empty, unmeaning sound? and does it signify that, so far from providing for the government of the moral universe, He has, on the contrary, abandoned

it to the wild chance and confusion of chaos? Do we not find that, through the working of cause and effect, "order is Heaven's first law"? And though that law is a "mighty maze, but not without a plan," too vast for human comprehension, yet if we may infer that the moral government of God is carried on by the opposing agencies of good and evil, and that a greater amount of good than evil results from the working of these opposite forces, the act of creation, although compounded with evil, both natural and moral, stands confessedly justified in point of goodness. And we are then enabled, with Milton, to say,

> "That to the height of this great argument,
> I may assert eternal providence,
> And justify the ways of God to man."

Kingsdown, Bristol. G. Pulleyn Hinton.

PETER AND CEPHAS.

Sir,

In your last No., after insertion of a letter from "The Writer on Peter and Paul, their alleged Differences," you say, "We have received from our correspondent Peter his *promised* Pauline History of Cephas." The latter, I presume, you mean to insert in some future No. It was *promised* in my first paper. I am of opinion, therefore, that the writer of the letter above mentioned has been hasty in supposing "that I have not one line of argument to offer in behalf of my theory." He might have reserved his rather unseemly criticism of my theory until he had before him *the whole* of my Life of Cephas, which, though he has overlooked it, was promised as containing full proof of my theory. He was hasty also in assuming that "I imply that Conybeare and Howson favour my theory by reading Cephas instead of Peter in Galatians ii. 9," for I assume no such thing. I have quoted their note so far as it brings before us the fact "that Cephas, not Peter, is the reading of the best MSS. throughout this Epistle, as well as throughout the Epistles to Corinth, except in one passage, Galat. ii. 7, 8." Upon the fact contained in this first portion of the note, I have built my theory, throwing aside the latter part of the note, because it is a conjecture which it was not my business to dispute.

Hoping the Unitarian body, to whom alone my theory is submitted for fair criticism, will wait patiently for the whole proof I have to give in its favour, and that you will kindly insert this letter in your next No., I remain, yours, &c., Peter.

Ayr, Sept. 11, 1860.

[The "Pauline History of Cephas" shall be inserted in a future No.—Ed. C.R.]

CRITICAL NOTICES.

TRIBUTES TO THEODORE PARKER.

Lecture in the Birkenhead Unitarian Church, May 27. By Wm. Binns.

A Look at the Life of Theodore Parker: Indiana-Place Chapel, Boston, June 3. By James Freeman Clarke.

Sermon in Renshaw-Street Chapel, Liverpool, June 3. By S. A. Steinthal.

Lessons from the Life of Theodore Parker: Discourse in Hope-Street Church, Liverpool, June 10. By W. H. Channing.

It was not without fatal presentiment that we took occasion a few months ago, on Theodore Parker's retirement from public duty, to estimate his character, labours and writings, and review his autobiographical Letter to his Boston friends (C.R., March, 1860). We did so with ardent admiration of the anti-slavery man, with unfeigned reverence for the scholar, with more of honest dissent than sympathy towards the conclusions of the theologian, and a self-respecting protest against his bitter and contemptuous treatment of those who hold a miraculous Christianity. We have nothing to recall or regret in that estimate. We felt his sickness to be as gentle an admonition against harsh judgment as we should now his death. Those who have now, in the tributes above named, formed their estimate in the presence of death instead of sickness, have spoken in some instances more strongly than we, and have with one consent joined in the disapproving as well as the admiring part of our estimate. Parker himself on one occasion expressing his preference to the *verum* over the *bonum de mortuis*, added, "It is no merit to die. Why praise a man because he is dead?" "I will remember this honesty, brother, in speaking of thee," says Mr. Freeman Clarke.

Mr. Binns's Lecture, while not neglecting the discrimination which all carefully shew, is the most thoroughly *en rapport* (so to speak) with the spirit of Theodore Parker. He avows in the Lecture and quotes the avowal in the Preface: "My chief reason for speaking is gratitude for religious aid that I have received. In some of the darkest of my own experiences, his works mainly guided me into light and truth, and when a natural revulsion from orthodox theology had plunged me into unbelief, blessed me with a restored faith in God and the liberty of spiritual Christianity." We trace in Mr. Binns's style the infection, if not the imitation, of his master's, including some of its exaggerations and sins against good taste, as in his allusion to some doubtful Old-Testament miracles, and when he says: "We feel that the injustice of the Unitarians to him was the offspring of fear; his injustice to them was the offspring of love;" and describes one class of Unitarians as "men whose motto is, All possible truth has been attained by the past." He undiscriminatingly ranks Parker with "the Professors of our two Colleges," with Macnaught, Jowett, Baden Powell and Rowland Williams. Some of this group will not approve the classification. But he adds that he himself feels Mr. Parker's reasons for rejecting the New-Testament miracles insufficient. And he virtually rebukes the arrogant self-exaggeration of Parker, who thought that "he stood alone in maintaining the infinite perfection of God," which (Mr. Binns well says) "is but the original idea of Jesus of Nazareth, put forth in different words."

Mr. Clarke, who affirms the soundness of his THEOLOGY strictly so called, namely, "his doctrine of God," adds: "His CHRISTOLOGY, or doctrine of Christ, I have thought defective, and his ANTHROPOLOGY, or doctrine of Man, somewhat defective too in important particulars." Mr. Steinthal and Mr. Channing point out also the one-sidedness and hardness of his theology. "It appeared to me (says the latter) to be defective in more respects than there is time even to note. From first to last, his system, so far as he had elaborated and expressed it, was mere Naturalism, and it never rose higher than a natural theology." Mr. Steinthal speaks as a true philosopher of the empire of natural law as not co-extensive with that of God. It was for saying essentially such things as these that the Unitarian ministers in America were branded by Parker and his friends as bigots and persecutors; and he, after repudiating as strongly as man could the special claims of Christianity as a miraculous revelation, and calling those who acknowledge such claims by every term of intellectual contempt, was *hurt* at being regarded by them as not a disciple of Christ. "The most unmanly thing," surely, that Parker did or experienced! His best friends are satisfied now to pass by his ideas of Christianity and do justice to his Theism; and even this they find not so *absolutely* certain, complete and admirable as his strong mind and will had represented it.

There is a singular diversity in the estimates formed by his two countrymen and friends, Clarke and Channing, of the work in which alone his theological opinions are methodized. Mr. Clarke says: "His *Discourse on Religion* in his first printed book remains his best one;" and thinks his rapidity of publication afterwards deteriorated him as an author. "He did not give himself time to go down as deeply as he might, and to meditate as fully as he might, before he printed." Mr. Channing, on the contrary, says: "His *Discourse of Matters pertaining to Religion*, by which he was first widely known, was the collection of a course of lectures, rapidly prepared, and delivered from week to week amidst the anxieties of his earliest controversy. And though he afterwards revised them and added references and notes, yet this book *should never be regarded*—what surely its author never himself designed it—as a *systematic statement of his mature opinions*." Certainly he published nothing else half so systematic, and never (so far as we know) repudiated or modified the *Absolute* system of religion there propounded. But Mr. Channing is partly right in pleading, as in explanation of the haste and immaturity of many of his too numerous writings (as confessed by Mr. Clarke), that "the Theologian had voluntarily made sacrifice of scholarly reputation, nay of dearly-prized studies, at the shrine of humanity. He longed to be a thinker and a writer; conscience commanded him to be an actor in Reform, and he obeyed. Honour to him for his generous deed! His life became his *Body of Divinity*."

All his friends and eulogists virtually accept it as such; and his zeal for human good, especially for the deliverance of the oppressed in his own country, will be Theodore Parker's immortality of pure renown, when his rash and crude theology is less read than at present. Yet, even here, one lover and friend after another is forced to regret "his bitterness," "his resentment," "his want of feeling or of taste, bordering upon irreverence," his "keenly satiric sketches of social customs and individual character," his "pungent criticism," his "too indignant

scorn," his "wild humour" "unleashing his swift wit like hounds on their prey." "Energetic and stubborn, he gave harder blows than he knew or meant." His "invectives—the most terrible which modern literature knows—against the kidnappers, the pro-slavery politicians, the pro-slavery priests and the slave-catching commissioners, were sometimes (says Mr. Clarke) cruel and severe,—in the spirit of Moses, David and John the Baptist, rather than in that of Christ. Such extreme severity, whether in Jew or Christian, defeats its own object; for it is felt to be excessive and unjust. I cannot approve of Theodore Parker's severity. I consider it false, because extravagant; unjust, because indiscriminate; unchristian, because relentless and unsympathizing." We cannot find scriptural authority, however, for Mr. Clarke's application of his text ("What went ye out to see? A man clothed in soft raiment?"), as implying that John the Baptist was a man of Parker's faults. "I took for my text the saying of Jesus concerning John the Baptist; in which the Saviour *seems to excuse the harshness and rudeness* of his precursor, on the ground that such a work as he had to do required a man whose faults would lie in that direction. A civil and smooth-spoken gentleman, a man of decencies and proprieties, would not have drawn the multitudes into the wilderness to hear their sins denounced and their wickedness condemned. Nor would such an orator have gathered crowds into the Music Hall. Theodore was the John the Baptist of our day—the prophet of a transition state, when the law had ended, but the gospel only just begun. * * * And as Jesus apologized for John, and excused his harshness on the ground that such a character was required for such a work; so I doubt not that if our brother failed in the same way, it was for the same reason; and I think that our Master will make for him the same excuse." Most heartily we join in the conclusion, though we doubt the parallel.

The Edinburgh Review.

The No. opens with an article on the effects of the multiplication of Gold, founded of course on the treatise by the French economist, Michel Chevalier. The reviewer is captivated by the Frenchman's very extravagant estimate that there will be a fall in the value of gold of 50 per cent. The writers on the subject seem to us scarcely to give adequate importance to the extraordinary increase in the use of gold, in coin, in ornaments for the person and the house, which is taking place throughout the world. Had there not been, concurrently with the extension of commerce and domestic and international intercourse of the inhabitants of the world, the increased supply of the precious metal which is the standard of value, a revolution in prices would have been inevitable. Nothing is more wonderful or more calculated to strengthen our faith in Providence, than the way in which the Omnipotent Ruler *times* the discoveries and changes which effect economical and social revolutions.—The second article, on the Diaries and Correspondence of George Rose, is chiefly remarkable as affording another indication of the tendency which has set in among writers of various opinions, to put a higher estimate on the political conduct and aims of William Pitt the younger than formerly prevailed in liberal circles. Will the revelations to be made by the diaries and letters published half a century hence, raise the charac-

ters of our present race of statesmen? We fear not.—An article follows on the history of Lorraine and of its junction with France. Its special claim to interest is that it discloses, on the part of former French rulers, the policy of annexation and assimilation which, as recently developed by the fraudulent genius of the Emperor of the French, has awakened the anxious vigilance of Europe.—The next article, on the latest Geological Discoveries, has many things that will interest every intelligent reader. Speaking of Sir Roderick Murchison's last contributions to the science of geology, the reviewer remarks,—

"The succession of life from the lower to the higher forms of existence is the grand principle which he traces in all the geological records of nature; but in a very different sense from that which has recently been brought forward by Mr. Darwin. Sir R. Murchison finds in the great geological periods which he has described, the clearest evidence, not of an unbroken series of spontaneous development by a process of 'natural selection or otherwise,' but of distinct species, called successively into existence and adapted to the existing conditions of the globe."

The article which comes next has for its subject the Papal Government in its political rather than its religious character, and a damning statement of reckless crimes and follies does the history of the patrimony of St. Peter present. What the Bourbons, ever docile pupils of their spiritual head, have been in Spain and Naples, that the representative of St. Peter at Rome has been generation after generation and century upon century. The struggle between the Lombards and the Papal power is well described by the reviewer, and we extract a passage or two on this subject:

"Moreover, the popes were ardent advocates of the favourite and popular tenets of the Romans. The Romans were passionately Catholic, or anti-Arian; and in the great Arian controversy the Roman bishops shewed great devotion to the Catholic cause. . . . . But it was in their hostility to the Lombards that the popes shewed themselves the most complete representatives of the feelings of the Roman people. The Lombards were Arians; the Romans, as we have said, vehemently Catholic. The hatred between the two nations was intense. Liutprand, the bishop of Cremona, a Lombard, writes:

"'We despise so deeply the Roman name, that in our anger we know no greater insult for our enemy than to call him a Roman, for in this name alone we comprehend all that is ignoble, cowardly, luxurious, lying, and all the vices.' . . . .

"The Lombard kingdom existed for 206 years. The people shewed great aptitude for civilization. The Lombard code of laws is the best collection of Gothic laws in existence. This formidable nation were Arians; and besides being Arians, they maintained in Italy a separate and exclusive existence. Unlike Theodoric and his Ostrogoths, they never amalgamated with the inhabitants. The result must have been, in time, that the Roman name, all remains of Roman institutions, and the Roman Catholic religion itself, would have perished before them. Except the Exarchate and Rome, they already possessed the whole of Italy; and when, at last, they conquered the Exarchate, the Roman pontiff, Gregory III., was convulsed with terror. In vain he wrote the most suppliant letters to Constantinople. The emperor Constantine Copronymus was, however, willing that he should apply to Pepin, king of the Franks. Pepin descended twice into Italy; the second time, at the pressing solicitation of a letter indited by St. Peter himself, in which the apostle promised him all felicity, both in this world and the next, if he would free his church and tomb from the hated Lombards. The arms of Pepin were successful. The Exarchate was wrested from the Lombards, and the keys of its

cities were placed on the altar of St. Peter. Twenty years passed by. Again the Church felt the perilous neighbourhood of the Lombards, and again its chief implored the assistance of Charlemagne. The son of Pepin likewise descended into Italy, and with the exception of the great Lombard duchy of Benevento, the dreaded kingdom disappeared under the dominion of the Franks."

The sixth article is devoted to Dr. Vaughan's Revolutions in English History, in which, while the deserved censure is pronounced on the blunders which disfigure his narrative, justice is done to "the sound and practical character of his general views."—Then follows a pleasant, genial article on the Life of Ary Scheffer. In common with all that is exalted in principle or distinguished in science and art, Scheffer looked on the subjugation of France under its present iniquitous yoke with an intensity of sorrow and despair. As a painter, it is interesting to know that, as he advanced in life and in power as an artist, the religious element grew within him and increased in its sway over his thoughts. The reviewer quotes with approbation this passage from Mrs. Grote's interesting Memoir of the painter:

"The books of the Old Testament were perhaps those most frequently seen in his hand during the last eight years of his life. The study of pastoral, primitive, rude forms of society—with the touching episodes here and there occurring in the history of those early peoples—had an unfading attraction for Scheffer, whilst it served to prevent his mind and thoughts from brooding over the actual state of things in France. Still, it was from the New Testament that the larger number of his sacred compositions were taken; for he loved to dwell upon the humanizing influences and devotional feelings connected with the mission of Jesus Christ, whose ideal lineaments it was ever his loftiest ambition to portray."

The article on Serf Emancipation in Russia shews how a long course of wrongdoing makes it a matter of difficulty and danger to begin to do right. So it proved to us when we emancipated the West-Indian slaves; so also when we gave political power to the Roman Catholics of Ireland after a century or two of unjust exclusion and oppression.—An article on the recently published Correspondence of Alexander von Humboldt exposes with not undue severity the gross impropriety of the publication of cynical remarks, which not only painfully affect the living, but degrade the character of the distinguished man in professed reverence of whom they are given, without editorial suppression, to the world.—Of the three last articles, the only one which claims our notice is a too brief account of Cardinal Mai's impure and interpolated edition of the Vatican Codex. The article is rather historical than critical. We extract two passages; the first describes the relation of Erasmus to the Vatican Codex:

"The earliest public mention that we have of the Vatican MS. is in the controversies in which Erasmus was engaged soon after he published his Greek Testament. As his Latin version which stood by the side of the Greek differed in many particulars from the Vulgate, not only in phraseology, but also in reading, every opponent of the revival of letters, however innocent of all acquaintance with Greek, was able to make this Latin version the ground of complaint and invective. And especially was this the case in connection with the text 1 John v. 7, which had then for five or six centuries established for itself a place in the Latin Vulgate; but which Erasmus, following *Greek* authorities, omitted in his two earlier editions (1516 and 1519). For as to this passage, Erasmus had received some intimation that the Greek MS. in large letters in the Papal Library did not contain it; and in appealing to its

authority against its censors, he was fortified by an extract made in 1521, by Paulus Bombosius, the then Prefect of the Vatican Library; the extract shewed plainly that this Papal Codex agreed with Erasmus in the *omission*, if indeed it was an omission and not a *non-insertion*."

Of Mai's edition, this is the reviewer's judgment:

"There is nothing to raise a suspicion of intentional dishonesty, but the lack of care and want of judgment are manifest. The additions introduced from other MSS. to supply, not only the defects in the Vatican Codex produced through the injuries of time, but also the passages which this most ancient authority never did contain, exhibit a great want of judgment; and as to the execution, after all that had been done, there are pages which look like proof-sheets, examined by no one but a rather unintelligent compositor. Those who have compared Mai's edition with the previously existing collections, find that in several places the reading of the common text is retained through mere oversight."

The reviewer closes his article with an allusion to the MS. recently found at Mount Sinai by Professor Tischendorf, and now removed to St. Petersburg:

"This MS. in antiquity vies with the Vatican Codex; for this was an admitted fact before any part of it was known, except the portion of the Old Testament, which has been at Leipsic for the last sixteen years. Tischendorf states that the text of the New Testament in it is of the same class as that of the Vatican MS., but he gives no particulars. Its publication is, therefore, much to be wished; and it is probable that its indefatigable discoverer may himself bring out such a *fac-simile* edition, as shall be worthy of one of the most precious monuments of Biblical antiquity. But though we do not know the readings of Tischendorf's Codex, those who are acquainted with textual criticism can feel sure what their general character must be in a document of that age. We may well be impatient for further acquaintance with this MS.; and it is much to be hoped that some experienced collator may thoroughly examine the original, so that we shall not have to wait the length of time that publication of the text must necessarily take. Such a collation, so far from being detrimental, would be beneficial to the subsequent *fac-simile* edition."

POPULAR UNITARIAN TRACTS.

Home! Sweet Home! A Tract for Families. By John R. Beard, D.D. 10 pp.

A Common-sense View of the Bible. 8 pp.

A Break in the Clouds. By T. S. Arthur. 4 pp.

A Dream of the Blessed Ones who walk in White. By J. Page Hopps. 4 pp.

Brooke Herford's Tract Covers. Nos. 1—4.

THE missionary agencies now happily at work in the Unitarian body render a supply of wholesome and popular tracts necessary, and it is satisfactory to find that in more quarters than one there is the desire and the ability to supply the want. The philanthropic and Christian warrior going forth to encounter error and sin must be supplied with the best arms. Happily there are in our midst men willing to do for our missionaries what Whitworth and Armstrong are doing for our soldiers by the application of modern science and practical skill in the manufacture of arms. Dr. Beard is an experienced manufacturer of these small arms, and we hope that his admirable tract will find a welcome in thousands of our cottages. It may whisper some valuable

secrets to fathers, mothers and children in other homes than those of the poor. "Home! sweet Home!" should be placed at once in every Tract Society's catalogue.—The other tracts named at the head of our page are the first fruits of Mr. Brooke Herford's spirited plan for issuing, under the general title of "Home Pages," popular moral and religious tracts. His purpose cannot be better explained than by himself in a portion of a circular letter just issued by him:

"I have commenced with September a monthly issue of 'Home Pages,'—short readable tracts, such as I feel (after fourteen years' experience in district visiting) will be popular and acceptable in the homes of the poor. They will be mostly in the narrative form: all religious, and some few distinctively Unitarian; but even these will be made interesting by incident and illustration. Each month, two, three or four tracts will be issued, to the amount of sixteen pages in all. I have also prepared a series of four Tract Covers, of two different sizes, so as to suit not only the 'Home Pages,' but tracts of larger size already in circulation."

The three specimens of "Home Pages" now issued are most excellent. They are varied in style and aim. The "Common-sense View of the Bible" will help both to dissipate orthodox prejudices against Unitarians and to teach correct ideas respecting the nature of the sacred volume. It has not by any means exhausted the subject, and will, we hope, be followed by other pages directed to the same end. "A Break in the Clouds" should be read by every husband who prizes domestic sunshine. Its four pages of simple narrative contain more good sense and right feeling than is to be found in many volumes of tracts of larger pretension. We hope Mr. Arthur will be a frequent contributor to Mr. Herford's Pages. Mr. Hopps's "Dream" is imaginative and poetical, but has a fine practical aim, and is thoroughly Christian in its teaching. The "Tract Covers" might, we think, be made with advantage a little thicker and stronger. The three pages of letter-press given with each could not be better. Why should not the economy of paper which is respected here be also attended to in the tracts? Two of the three tracts now issued have vacant spaces which might be advantageously occupied with lines from some of our religious poets, or with "thoughts that breathe and words that burn," on a topic congenial with the tract, from Channing, Ware, Hutton or Carpenter. We desire to tender to Mr. Brooke Herford our respectful gratitude for the zeal and judgment with which he is promoting missionary work. We look upon this work with no common interest. In addition to its direct blessings, it will, we hope, save our denomination from the habit of metaphysical dreaming, which is at present its greatest danger.

The Christian Examiner (Boston), Nos. CCXX. and CCXXI., *July* and *September*.

We have in this Unitarian periodical, which has long-established claims on our regard, a mixture of the scriptural and the transcendental views held by various eminent divines of our denomination in America. The editors will, we trust, keep the mystical subordinate to the more useful portion of their journal; and we will confess that we wish we could again have specimens of the fine practical and religious discourses, written in plain and intelligible English, such as adorned the Christian Examiner

some twenty years ago. The two Nos. now on our table are rather above than below the standard of merit of the Examiner. The July No. opens with a somewhat superficial article on the English language. The writer reviewed (Mr. Marsh) has discovered that Professor Newman has in his translation set Homer to the tune of "Yankee Doodle." Both Mr. Marsh and his reviewer join in a duet of self-gratulation when discussing the influence of America upon our common language. An article sufficiently learned follows on the conceptions of the Evil Spirit traceable in various systems of religion: it has the affected title, unintelligible to more than half who read it, of "Analogues of Satan." The remarks on the "Temporal Power of the Popes" are timely, strong, and we believe essentially true. Then follows, under the title of the "Broad Church," the discourse delivered before the ministerial conference by the President of the Unitarian Association. With much that is fanciful, there is some fine catholic sentiment in the discourse. The best article in the No. is that on John Calvin, which we would recommend, as fairly stating *both* sides of the case, to those of our readers who have been perplexed by Mr. Martineau's eloquent commendations of the religious dictator of Geneva. The reviewer gives this summary of Calvin's character:

"He was a man of godly sincerity; a very stern man; a man utterly regardless of what we call human rights; a most unlovely man in some respects, but not a man devoted to selfish aims, as appears from his honourable poverty and stainless purity of life; a man of great virtues and great faults,—faults which in part were the errors of the time, in part the excess of an austere nature and bodily disease, in part, too, springing from the frailties and passions of our common humanity; a great man, whose power for good or evil was larger than belongs to ordinary manhood, and whose signature was written with an iron hand upon his age."

Of the September No., which has just reached our hands, the most attractive articles seem to be, on "The Women of Thackeray" (vindicating, with only moderate success, that author from the charge of injustice to the better sex); on Dr. Huntington, the recent American *pervert* to orthodoxy; on St. Augustine; and on German Hymns. From the article on Dr. Huntington we learn that that capricious gentleman has just published an edition of Dr. Bickersteth's feeble "Rock of Ages," and has prefixed to it an introduction, in which he proves himself an adept already in some of the arts of intolerant misrepresentation from which Unitarians are wont to suffer at the hands of their orthodox brethren. We learn with some amusement that Dr. Huntington makes use of the modern theory, so much in vogue with some of our friends, of subjective spiritual knowledge as a bulwark of the doctrine of the Trinity. But what will our philosophical friends say to the rough handling which religious intuitions in this case receive?

"It is precisely what the Romanist says in defence of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, but it is a very poor plea to offer. No such pretended subjective spiritual knowledge can have any weight as argument, nor can the pretence convey to a delicate mind any other idea than that of vulgar cant. That Dr. Huntington, or any other man, has a private interior witness of the Trinity, or of any doctrine, and that he feels this to be cheerful and comforting, is no reason why another person should receive it. He cannot offer the result of his experience in 'closets, and sanctuaries, and sacraments,' as a substitute for the 'dialectic process' which all who would be convinced have a right to

demand. His illumination may be good for himself, but it is good for nobody else; and the less that is said in argument about such witness from above, the better. It is intolerable arrogance for any one to claim that an inner acquaintance with this doctrine has given him superior capacity of understanding it as a proposition to the intellect, or of weighing its scriptural and rational proofs."

The reviewer brings into inconvenient proximity Dr. Huntington's present depreciatory estimate of Unitarians, their faith, their plans of action, preaching, &c., and antitrinitarian statements made and printed by him a very few years ago. Dr. Huntington's criticisms on the church he has recently abandoned are imprudently harsh. The reviewer well observes (p. 197),

"A man has the right to change his faith and to repudiate utterly all his former opinions, even after professions of matured confidence and eternal allegiance. But the statements of such a person concerning his former faith are to be very cautiously received, and to be taken with large allowance. No sudden convert is a reliable witness concerning the views he has abandoned. In proportion as his friendship was more ardent, his hostility is more bitter, and his rhetoric of defence becomes his rhetoric of attack."

In answer to Dr. Huntington's charge that Unitarians are declining in aggressive zeal and pecuniary liberality, the reviewer says,—and the remarks are partly true as respects England as well as America,—

"The last few years have shewn a wider propagation of their religious connection, and a larger increase in the direct agencies of their body, than any previous period of their history. More ministers, converts to their faith from the faith of the exclusive sects, have been welcomed into their body within the last twelve months, than in any year of the 'forty or fifty' which Dr. Huntington assigns as their term of age; and the vacancy which his retirement leaves has, in number at least, and perhaps in something more, been already fourfold filled. The special contributions in money have been steadily increasing, and if Dr. Huntington had taken the trouble to consult the reports of that Unitarian Association of which he was once an officer, he would see how much more liberal are the churches in caring for it than they were twenty years ago. The gifts of the single Unitarian Society in St. Louis within the last ten years exceed all the contributions of the Unitarian body in that period when Dr. Huntington would have us think it was so liberal and powerful. Antioch College alone is an answer to the charge that 'the confidence that gives money has abated.' It is indeed urged, that enough is not given, that we do not the half or a tithe of what we could do or ought to do; but this very importunity, this very urgency of lament, is a proof that enthusiasm is more living, and that there is quicker sensitiveness to religious needs. The same plea is pressed by the other religious bodies. Large and various as are the gifts of the Orthodox sects to specially religious causes, they are continually reminded that enough is not given. And if anywhere the lament be repeated, that there is lack of zeal in Church extension and of gifts in its behalf, it is in the journals of the Church of which Dr. Huntington has just become a member. The 'endless surprise' at the small amount of money donations is not peculiar to the Unitarian body; and gross injustice is done when this is cited as evidence of their 'failure.' Dr. Huntington has had too many personal proofs of the 'confidence that gives money,' to bring hastily a charge of waning generosity against the body he has left."

More calm and more consistent than Dr. Huntington must be the witness who will succeed in proving that Unitarianism is a "disastrous practical experiment."

INTELLIGENCE.

SOIRÉE TO REV. J. C. GANGOOLY.

The remark is sometimes made that the Unitarians of London do not possess the same warmth of feeling, the same energy and zeal in religious matters, the same desire to promote and foster missionary action, whether at home or abroad, that characterise their brethren of Liverpool, Manchester and other towns in the North. We do not believe this statement has ever been entirely borne out by fact. But if in years gone by it has been to a certain extent true, facts now directly contradict it. Recent meetings in London have been in every way as successful as those held in other parts of the country. We have just had an illustration of this. On Thursday evening, Sept. 13th, a soirée was held at Radley's Hotel, Blackfriars, to welcome Mr. Gangooly on his arrival in London. The time fixed for this his first appearance in the Metropolis was in several respects unfavourable to a large and influential meeting. It had been intended that Mr. Gangooly should spend two or three weeks in London; but indisposition and other circumstances induced him to alter his plans, and only a very short notice could be given of the meeting. It was also found that very many, both ministers and laymen, who would have been foremost in offering the right hand of fellowship to Mr. Gangooly, had taken advantage of the bright weather which had at length beamed upon us, and were scattered far and wide over the country. Under ordinary circumstances, such a meeting would have fallen under the charge of the London District Unitarian Society, but nearly all the gentlemen who so energetically conduct the operations of that Society were absent from the Metropolis. The Committee of the Unitarian Association, in anticipation of the arrival of Mr. Gangooly, had appointed a sub-committee to make arrangements for his reception and entertainment. By this sub-committee the soirée was organized, and the meeting took place under the authority of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association. Mr. J. E. Clennell, the sub-committee and the stewards, are entitled to commendation for their efficient conduct of the business entrusted to them. Notwithstanding all the drawbacks to which we have alluded, the soirée was a complete success. The room was crowded, many of the visitors being compelled to stand during the whole of the proceedings. The welcome accorded to Mr. Gangooly was of the warmest and most enthusiastic kind. The heart evidently went with the hand. None who heard the simple, natural eloquence in which Mr. Gangooly gave utterance to his thoughts, could doubt his thorough earnestness and sincerity, or have any fear lest the work he was about to undertake should not succeed, if success depended on his exertions. It was evident, indeed, that, as he himself said, God had put into that weak and slender frame a large amount of moral strength.—We now give a brief account of the proceedings of the meeting.

The chair was occupied by Rev. THOMAS MADGE, who thought this was an occasion peculiarly interesting to Unitarian Christians. After a short sketch of the circumstances which led to Mr. Gangooly's conversion to Unitarianism, he said he did not wonder that orthodox missionaries met with so little success among the Hindoos. Very different doctrines were needed to make way with them. Mr. Gangooly found it impossible to believe what those missionaries taught. He was nearly falling into simple Deism. In this crisis he met with Mr. Dall, and in Unitarianism he found that which his heart desired. But in openly avowing Christianity he had lost caste, and the loss of caste involved terrible consequences. This was proof enough of sincerity and earnestness. He (Mr. M.) was sure Mr. Gangooly would be received by the meeting with the warmest welcome, and would have their earnest prayers for the success of the arduous work in which he was shortly to engage. He concluded by offering him the right hand of fellowship.

Mr. HODGSON PRATT had much pleasure in moving a resolution of welcome to Mr. Gangooly. The present meeting bore a great resemblance to one held some months since in that room, when the subject of Indian Missions was discussed. He had said at that meeting that the work of conversion must be done by natives. When in India, he could not help contrasting the brightness of the country with the depression of the people. Everywhere there was oppression; everywhere the people had distrust of each other; everywhere there was a moral chaos. The present was a time of transition. The religious convictions of the natives had been undermined, without any other or better being given in their stead. Faith was everywhere diminishing; there would soon be nothing but atheism and disbelief. This was a state of things which called on every man to do

something towards altering it. The literature of the country was full of corruption, full of mischief, full of everything that is degrading. He drew this picture that Unitarians might strive to build up a pure faith. The history of Mr. Gangooly proved that orthodox doctrines would not satisfy his countrymen. Christianity presented in an orthodox form met with no response from him; in a Unitarian form it did. The teachings of the Vedantists were a failure. He hoped Mr. Gangooly would tell the Vedantists and Deists that he was nothing of an eclectic,—that Christ's teachings were commands, nothing less. He believed his friends would bring the natives and the Vedantists to a better knowledge of each other. The duty of Unitarians was to lay Christianity broad and deep, and help the natives in every way in their power. It must not be expected that Christianity in India would be a reproduction of Trinitarianism or Unitarianism as it is here; it would be an Indian Christianity. Success could only be obtained by a larger employment of native labour. Natives must teach the natives. Any influence Englishmen have made might be washed away in a few months. They cannot understand the natives—the natives cannot understand them. There was no progress so essential as religious progress. Laws were made that there might be perfect equality before the law; but they proved a failure; and they must be so without a vital religion, a religion that is a power. Native missionaries were the only men to produce such a religion. Mr. Pratt concluded a very able speech by moving the following resolution: "That this meeting offer to Joguth Chundra Gangooly a respectful and cordial welcome, and desire to express to him their satisfaction in greeting him as a Christian brother, and their earnest hope that to the last hour of his existence he may rejoice in having entered the Christian fold, and may find in the faith of Jesus Christ the truth which satisfies the intellect, the moral strength that regulates the life, and the spiritual influences that expand and elevate the soul."

Rev. J. Panton Ham, in seconding the resolution, had no intention of making a speech. He had little to add to what had been said by Mr. Hodgson Pratt, who had gained so much experience in India. He had had nothing of the kind. He would only say, in tendering Mr. Gangooly a cordial welcome, that he did it heartily, in the perfect conviction that he was thoroughly sincere. What he had gone through *proved* it. By accepting Christianity he *had* become an outcast. No higher proof *of sincerity* could be had than this. He (Mr. Ham) thought this the most interesting meeting he had attended since he became a Unitarian. Having himself been originally intended for an Indian missionary, he fully sympathised with much that had been said by the mover of the resolution. He thought many of those who went to India, in spite of their earnestness and sincerity, were very inefficient. No Englishman could have much success. The work must be done by men of the highest caste like Mr. Gangooly. We must begin with the highest caste and descend to the lower; for, as Mr. Gangooly had said, if water be poured on the head, it will cover the whole body. Unitarians might congratulate themselves in welcoming a Brahmin convert to their form of faith. No Christians but Unitarian Christians could do the work of converting India, and no Unitarian Christians but men like Mr. Gangooly.—The resolution was unanimously adopted.

Rev. W. Forster proposed the following resolution: "That our sincere and affectionate wishes will accompany Mr. Gangooly on his great mission; and that it is our earnest prayer to the Great Father of all that he may enjoy for many years the exalted pleasure of carrying to the minds and hearts of his countrymen the truths of an intelligent, benignant and practical religion." He was sure the resolution would have a response in every intellect and every heart present. All would wish that Mr. Gangooly's life might be spared for a long, long time, that he would be a burning and a shining light, and dispel some of the darkness that had been so long gathering in India. He had a difficult task to perform; and unless he had great faith in his God, in the truth of the doctrines he had to teach, and in humanity when properly understood, he would indeed find it a difficult task. He had to preach God as a Father, the God whom Jesus taught and imitated in his character and life. If he went with this testimony, he would succeed beyond his most sanguine hopes. A man going with views like these must produce a great and permanent influence in India. But he must not go merely with our wishes—mere wishes would not do; there must be works. We must do our utmost for the propagation of the views we hold. We must form a Missionary Society, to send out missionaries to India. There was not a congregation in England which would not do its part. It was sometimes said that charity should begin at home; but should it stay at home? If charity stayed at home, it would no longer be charity, but would be converted into selfishness. Mr. Forster concluded by

wishing that the Divine blessing may attend Mr. Gangooly.

Mr. MICHAEL ANDREWS, of Belfast, seconded the resolution, which was carried unanimously.

Mr. GANGOOLY, who was loudly cheered on rising, said that he left India as an outcast; but the sympathy and kindness he had received from his friends alleviated the trials and the sufferings he had gone through, and a continuance of such feelings would alleviate those that were to come. He heartily reciprocated their kind feelings. From the fact of their assembling to welcome him as a convert, he perceived that they took an interest in the Indian Unitarian Mission. Mr. Pratt had spoken of the character of the natives, the Deists, the Vedantists, and the importance of native labour to convert the native. Since he left India, he had seen during his travels a great deal of the Christian life. Great was the contrast between it and the Hindoo religion. When he saw what the one was and what the other, he felt very sorry. If he had four mouths with which to speak, he could give but a poor sketch of the sad condition of India. There was no fear of his becoming like the Anglo-Indian missionaries. Though he had been two years in America, where everything was so different from that to which he had been accustomed, he remained, with respect to eating, drinking and dress, as much a Brahmin as ever. Eating and dressing did not make the Christian, but what a man believed and felt. He had adopted no English habits, therefore Christianity would not suffer through him in India. In reference to himself, he said he was a Brahmin by birth and profession; he had had high position. He used to look on the low caste with disrespect; but now that he had been taught by Christ, he felt so humble, that he saw no difference between himself and the lowest caste. He would honestly say, that he had been for two years a hypocrite in India, playing a double part. He had been a Brahmin outwardly, a Christian inwardly. Brahmins could not treat the low caste properly unless they got the spirit of humility from him who washed the feet of the low caste in Judea. English schools and colleges in India had done great things. Under the Brahmins, the people were ignorant; but the English government had opened their eyes, and now they see. Men even among the low caste study Shakspere and Milton. English preaching makes few converts; English literature many. No missionary he ever saw could convert him to Christianity; his missionary was he who learnt, not at Oxford or Cambridge, but of his Father. He was led to inquire what Christianity was; he had the opinion it was nothing but nonsense; but his anticipations were disappointed. He was at once struck with the sublime beauty of the words of the Divine Master. He wished to inquire further, but he had no books. There was a saying, that "Where there's a will, there's a way." That was quite true, and at length he obtained a New Testament in his native tongue. The Sermon on the Mount was a beautiful, sublime thing. He studied the life of Christ, and found it far better than that of Hindoo gods and goddesses. His definition of Christianity was, that he should feel for and love the low castes wherever they might be found. Humanity he thought the best book to tell us what are our relations towards men and towards God; for humanity is not totally depraved. The price he had given for Christianity was tremendously large, and he hoped God would make him prize it more and more. Being desirous to pray to our Father in a Christian way, he bought a Prayer-book; it was the Book of Common Prayer. He liked it well, but not the endings of the prayers. It was different from the New Testament. "God the Holy Ghost," "God the Son," was not the teaching of the New Testament. God is the Father, and Christ the Son—not God the Son. He read the Athanasian Creed, but that seemed to him a bundle of sublime inconsistencies. Then he went to the Deists, but he found they had no moral courage. He himself was not a fair specimen of the intelligence of the Hindoos, but God had given him a large amount of moral courage. If the Deistical Church numbered hundreds of thousands, the condition of India would not improve.—He would say a few words about the Indian Mission. We had little knowledge how much good that mission had done. He was pained when he sometimes heard disparaging remarks made of Mr. Dall; he always blamed those who made them. Mr. Dall was just the man for the Hindoos. Those who formed his congregation belonged to the highest class in the country; all were men of worth, intelligence and repute, and attended not from curiosity, but to hear what was good. Quality should be the test, not quantity. He had no doubt that in time a large congregation would be formed in Calcutta. It was our business to rear Unitarianism there. The welcome we had given him shewed that we liked the fruit of the Indian Mission; if we relished the fruit, we must take care of the tree. He did not wish to speak of himself, but he had left father, mother, all, for it. If we did but nourish that tree heartily and warmly, God would

bless us with other and much better fruit than himself.

Mr. Alfred Lawrence moved and Mr. J. E. Clennell seconded the following resolution: "That this meeting has heard with great pleasure the interesting statement of Mr. Gangooly, and trusts that the Christian Mission in India, carried on conjointly by the Unitarian Associations of Great Britain and America, may be the means, under Providence, of spreading abroad in that important country the belief in one God the Father and one Lord Jesus Christ."

On the motion of Mr. J. T. Preston, a vote of thanks was tendered to the ladies and gentlemen composing the choir of Mr. Forster's church, who had diversified the proceedings by singing a selection of part songs, thus adding greatly to the pleasure of the evening.

The meeting was not without its substantial results. Various subscriptions and donations towards the Indian Mission were announced; among them, the munificent annual subscription of £100 from "E. B."

On the following Sunday, interesting discourses were preached by Mr. Gangooly —in the morning at Kentish Town, in the evening at Essex Street. At each chapel the congregation was very large. The collections were, in the morning, £26. 12*s.* 6*d.*; in the evening, £40. 5*s.*

SWINTON, NEAR MANCHESTER.

On Wednesday evening, August 23rd, the members of the Unitarian congregation and friends from Manchester assembled in the school-room connected with the chapel, when upwards of 120 persons sat down to tea. This social gathering had been arranged with a view to the accomplishment of a double purpose. The Rev. C. C. Nutter, it is known, has for several weeks, and since his resignation of the Lincoln pulpit, been associated with the Rev. J. C. Street in active missionary labours, under the direction of the Manchester District Unitarian Association. The kindly feelings of the Swinton congregation induced them to create an opportunity for giving expression to their sentiments of personal regard and their appreciation of the services of the Rev. C. C. Nutter, more especially in connection with their own place of worship. But in addition to this, they had also another object in view, not less indicative of the Christian zeal and liberality which distinguish this interesting and promising society. Mr. Boardman, *Jun.*, has for some years rendered most valuable aid in conducting the singing department of the religious services of the chapel. His important assistance at the organ and in the choir has been gratuitously and most cheerfully given. The congregation, therefore, have been anxious to evince their gratitude for his services, and also to express in a practical and tangible form their feelings of personal esteem and friendly regard.

An excellent repast, consisting of tea and other refreshments, most liberally provided under the superintendence of the ladies of the congregation, having been despatched, the chair was ably filled by Mr. Boardman, Sen. Having explained the objects of the meeting, the Chairman requested the Rev. J. C. Street to comply with the wishes of the congregation in giving to Mr. Nutter a cordial welcome, accompanied with the expression of an earnest desire for his prosperity and long continuance in the good work in which he was engaged amongst them. In a kind, generous and able manner, Mr. Street at once responded to the request, and in the course of his remarks alluded to the length of time he had been personally acquainted with his friend and coadjutor, even long before he had himself come into the Manchester district.—Mr. Nutter, in an appropriate address, full of interest and instruction, acknowledged with gratitude the honour conferred upon him and the kindly feelings evinced towards him on that and other occasions. — An anthem having been sung by the choir, Mr. Collyer next rose, and in a humorous but very effective manner commented upon various topics of local and congregational interest. His remarks, however, had more especial reference to the able services of Mr. Boardman, Jun., who had so cheerfully presided at the organ, and by his efforts in various ways had contributed to the welfare of the congregation. In the name of the congregation, accompanied with their audible and unanimous expressions of kind-hearted feeling and goodwill, Mr. Collyer proceeded to fulfil his pleasing duty of presenting to Mr. Boardman a handsome testimonial, consisting of a costly gold watch-guard and chain, on which was engraved the following inscription: "Presented to J. Boardman by the Swinton Unitarian Congregation, for his voluntary services in presiding at the Organ, 29th August, 1860."

Mr. Boardman, with evident emotion, expressed his sense of this mark of gratitude and esteem, and concluded a neat and appropriate address with the assurance that he should preserve to his dying hour the valuable memento of friendship and personal regard which he had just received from the hands of the Swinton congregation. A hymn was then sung; after which,

the Rev. J. C. Street delivered a very powerful and most instructive address on the progressive tendencies of the age in regard to the development of a free Christian theology. Messrs. Mitchell and M'Master followed with excellent speeches, and, had time permitted, other students of the Home Missionary College, who had come over from Manchester, would have addressed the meeting. The lateness of the hour, however, rendered it expedient that the meeting should now draw to a close. Thanks having been tendered to the ladies and to the Chairman, a hymn was sung, and the Rev. J. C. Street concluded the interesting and encouraging proceedings of the evening with prayer and benediction.

CHURCH OF THE DIVINE UNITY, NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

This beautiful church, situated in New Bridge Street, forms one of the noblest material monuments of Unitarian faith and zeal of which the history of our denomination can boast; and the history of the congregation—the first Nonconformist congregation in Newcastle—includes among the occupants of its pulpit many eminent and faithful confessors. The names of the most recent of these, the venerable Turner and the devoted and apostolic Harris, will ever be held in high honour in this scene of their labours.

The congregation have just called to their pulpit, with unanimous voice, the Rev. William Newton, late of Hinckley, Leicestershire, where he had previously achieved singular success in reviving our almost extinct cause. He is a preacher of unwonted earnestness and fervour, yet wholly free from any of those extravagances which too frequently accompany these characteristics; and great hopes are entertained that his transference to a wider sphere of labour may prove highly advantageous to the cause of Christian truth and righteousness. Some of our readers may not be aware that Mr. Newton was educated at Stepney College for ministry among the Baptists; but having embraced Unitarian views, he has ministered for several years to the congregation at Hinckley with great acceptance and success.

Mr. Newton commenced his pastorate in Newcastle on Sunday, August 19; and on the following Sunday, August 26, the inauguration services were continued by the Rev. H. W. Crosskey, of Glasgow, who occupied the pulpit morning and evening. The church was well filled by attentive congregations on both occasions. On Monday evening, the 27th, the members and friends of the congregation held a public soirée in the school-rooms of the church for the purpose of manifesting recognition and welcome of the new pastor. The ladies had decorated the rooms with evergreens and paintings, and spread the tables with various interesting objects of art and vertu. At one end of the room, the word "Welcome" was formed in letters of bay-leaves; beneath which were the initials "W. N." A numerous and respectable company were present.

During the formal part of the proceedings, the chair was occupied (in the unavoidable absence of Dr. Hayle, who had consented to preside) by Mr. Joseph Clephan, who in a very appropriate speech sketched the past history of the congregation down to the death of the Rev. George Harris and the election of the new pastor. On behalf of the congregation, he bade Mr. Newton hearty welcome.

Rev. W. Newton replied in an earnest and feeling speech. He was glad for the sake of the congregation that he was a young man, for in that he had the prospect of some years of labour among them as their minister.

Rev. R. Spears, of Stockton, was the next speaker; and was followed by Rev. G. B. Porteous, minister of the New Church (Swedenborgian), Percy Street, who said he deeply sympathized with the Unitarians, because they had ever asserted man's capability for goodness and the divine life.

Rev. H. W. Crosskey also addressed the meeting. He hoped that the reciprocity of feeling which had now been established between the Unitarian congregations of Glasgow and Newcastle would be strengthened and consolidated.

Votes of thanks were passed to Mr. Crosskey for his services of the previous day, and to the Chairman. Singing and pianoforte-playing varied the proceedings of the evening, which were of a pleasing and hopeful character.

OBITUARY.

Aug. 29, at her house, Thorndale, near Belfast, ANNETTE, relict of the late Samuel BRUCE, Esq., of the same place, aged 62 years. This excellent lady afforded to all who knew her a pattern of the virtues which adorn and dignify private life. She had experience both of the sorrows and the joys of this world. Born and reared in affluence, she was, by reverse of fortune, required at one period to depend for her

support on the exercise of her talents and acquirements. United to a husband of principles and dispositions akin to her own, seldom, if ever, was wedded life happier than hers; but, fifteen years ago, he was taken from her in the very prime of life and usefulness. Nobly did her character abide each test! In her prosperity she was not unduly elated, and in her afflictions she was sustained by faith and hope; in every phase of her varied fortune she manifested the graces of a meek, benevolent and pious spirit, and realized the strength and comfort which it brings. In the latter years of her life, during which, her sons being now grown up, she enjoyed comparative leisure from the calls of domestic duty, she devoted much of her time and thoughts to two of the benevolent institutions of Belfast,—the Lying-in Hospital and the Female Industrial School; in both of which her regular and devoted attention to their concerns, her kind interest in the welfare of their inmates, her sound judgment, perfect impartiality and conciliatory kindness, both of feeling and manner, made her an invaluable fellow-labourer to those with whom she was associated in their management. Her gentle virtues endeared her in no ordinary degree to her family and personal friends, and, though displayed in a comparatively retired and sequestered walk of life, became the means of diffusing important blessings to a wider circle, and attracted the respect and gratitude of the community in which she lived. Sincere were the regrets with which her remains were committed to the last resting-place, but blessed are the hopes which console the sorrow that is felt for those who depart from this life with a heart and character such as hers.

Sept. 1, at his residence in Prince's Park, Liverpool, THOMAS HARVEY, Esq., who had long carried on in that town the profession of a solicitor, in which he had earned the highest respect for his talents and integrity. He was a member of the congregation worshiping formerly in Paradise Street, and now in Hope Street, and shewed through life the same warm attachment to liberal opinions, political and religious, for which his father in his day had acquired an honourable name, at a time when it was dangerous to appear as the friend of reform. His illness, which was of several months' duration, was borne with Christian patience and serenity.

Sept. 7, at Evesham, RONALD, second son of Mr. Anthony MARTIN, surgeon, aged 12 years.

Sept. 9, at Dorking, at the residence of her sister, Mrs. AGATE, aged 71 years.

Sept. 9, at the house of Rev. Brooke Herford, Sheffield, Miss JANE HOPKINSON, aged 28 years.

Sept. 13, at Fenton Barns, N.B., ISABELLA, daughter of Mr. HOPE, aged 3 years and 2 months.

Sept. 16, at Taunton, MARGARET, the beloved wife of the Rev. William Arthur JONES, in her 42nd year.

Sept. 17, at Dukinfield, in the 59th year of her age, ESTHER, wife of Mr. J. LEIGH.

Sept. 18, in the 64th year of her age, LUCY, daughter of the late William FINCH, and granddaughter of Dr. Joseph Priestley.

MARRIAGES.

July 10, at the Unitarian church, Adelaide, South Australia, by Rev. J. Crawford Woods, B.A., Mr. WILLIAM HENRY WILLIAMS, of Clare, South Australia, to ELIZA, second daughter of Mr. Jas. BRYAN, North Adelaide.

Aug. 30, at the High-Pavement chapel, Nottingham, by Rev. P. W. Clayden, Mr. JOHN PALMER, of Lincoln, to PHŒBE, only daughter of the late Mr. William WALL, of Birmingham.

Sept. 14, at the Great Meeting, Coventry, by Rev. G. Heaviside, B.A., THOMAS SHERLOCK, of Birmingham, to CHARLOTTE BAKER, daughter of Mr. J. B. COMLEY, Coventry.

Sept. 17, at the Abbey chapel, Tavistock, by Rev. D. Griffith, Mr. JAMES CREBER GREENFIELD, of Torquay, to FRANCES WARE, only daughter of Mr. John SHELL, of Tavistock.

Sept. 18, at Bridport, by Rev. J. Lettis Short, Mr. BENJAMIN TEMPLAR, of Manchester, to SARAH, second surviving daughter of the late Mr. J. SUTTILL, of Pymore, near Bridport.

Sept. 20, at Mill-Hill chapel, Leeds, by Rev. Thomas Hincks, JAMES, second son of James KITSON, Esq., of Little Woodhouse, to EMILY CHRISTIANA, second daughter of Joseph CLIFF, Esq., of Western Flatts, Wortley.

THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CXCI.] NOVEMBER, 1860. [Vol. XVI.

WILLIAM PALEY.*

Nothing can more decidedly shew the wide and lasting appreciation of an author than the republication of his works, by able men, sixty or seventy years after their first appearance, with notes, additions and corrections, designed to bring them up to the mark of our later knowledge. This office was performed nine or ten years ago by Lord Brougham in reference to Paley's *Natural Theology*, and has now been taken up by Archbishop Whately in the case of the *Evidences of Christianity* and the *Moral Philosophy*. The *Horæ Paulinæ* scarcely admits of correction, nor seems to require addition. The Archbishop of Dublin's notes, and the very able estimate of Paley in the new edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica (by Professor Henry Rogers), suggest to us the propriety of bringing Paley before the readers of the Christian Reformer.

His four chief works form, of themselves, as regards subject if not treatment, a complete cycle of theological and moral inquiry. They were not indeed written in the order in which they should be read by a student (in the reverse order, in fact), the Natural Theology being the last completed; but he himself regarded them, when thus completed, as a comprehensive system of religion and morality; and this co-relation among them has no doubt tended, on the one hand, to give currency to the least valuable through the high credit of the rest; and, on the other, to prejudice those who dislike certain parts of his works against the independent merits of other parts. We shall now notice his writings in their proper order as indicating a system or course of study, and endeavour to discriminate their by no means uniform worth; first transcribing Mr. Rogers's very able and just estimate of the author's characteristic abilities.

---

* Paley's Moral Philosophy. With Annotations by Richard Whately, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin. 1859.

Paley's Evidences. With Annotations by Richard Whately, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin. 1859.

Life of Paley. By G. W. Meadley. 1809.

Life of Paley. By Rev. Edmund Paley, his Son. (Prefixed to Works. 7 vols. 1825.)

Life of Paley, in Encyc. Brit., 8th Edition, 1860, Vol. XVII. (pp. 199—206).

"The mind of Paley was acute rather than profound—discriminating and observant rather than comprehensive. If we except the mathematics, he had little aptitude for abstract science; the complex, subtle fugitive phenomena of consciousness, he had neither analytic skill, nor, we suspect, patience thoroughly to investigate. In almost the only place in all his works—the first two books of his *Moral Philosophy*—where refined analysis of the phenomena of consciousness was specially demanded, he is generally admitted to have signally failed. When he approaches the confines of metaphysical discussion, we see how apt he is to resile from it; in part, doubtless, from want of congeniality with such subjects, but in part also from his predominant love of the *practical*. Indeed, from the strength of this last characteristic, he would probably still have been an indifferent metaphysician, even had his talents for abstract science been much greater than they were. As it was, the sense of the practical generally decided at once the limits within which he was disposed to speculate. But within his own province—and a very extensive and most important one it is—it may be doubted whether any mind was ever more happily equipped for its functions. In all questions that involve a practical issue and which stop short of the metaphysical principles of knowledge and belief; questions which men must and will and do decide independently of the *theories* of those principles; in all questions which involve the investigation and comparison of *facts*, and just *logical* deduction from them, his powers are of the very first order. Few ever surpassed him in the discovery of apt arguments for his purpose, in the ingenuity with which he could combine apparently inconsiderable and often neglected data, and make them yield unexpected conclusions—in the selection and arrangement of his materials—in the skill with which he wrought them into his truly original structures of argumentation—in the fecundity and felicity of his illustrations or the exquisite precision and transparency of his style; and hence, on all his works he has stamped the image of his own genius, though the subjects (with one exception) were already worn threadbare. In surveying his ground, in determining what points to assail or defend, and in marshalling his forces, he had, in military phrase, the general's eye. His works in their whole laying out and plan—in their adaptation of part to part—exhibit not simply strong powers of logic, but constructive genius of a very high order. His imagination and wit were both tolerably active; indeed, the latter is represented as exuberant in private life, and as making him the delight of the social circle; but in his writings both these qualities are so completely *ministerial*, that there is probably hardly a single instance in all his works where an illustration is introduced to embellish or delight, or to minister to the sense of beauty. All are either exemplifications of the argument itself *(instances)* or designed to give a more graphic and precise expression to it. His style is the just reflex of his mind. It is eminently precise and luminous, both as regards diction and construction; as he is never guilty of *overdoing* in argument, but contents himself with the proofs that most speedily establish the conclusion, and there stops, so it is in his style. The chief excellence of all strictly argumentative composition must of course be perspicuity; for what is called beauty of style (as regards the greater part of its elements), there cannot be much scope. Perspicuity of style, however, Paley possesses in such perfection, that its very luci-

dity becomes beauty. Probably no man besides ever expressed so much scientific matter as he has expressed in his *Natural Theology*, without technicalities, without pedantry, in such easy colloquial diction, with such apt and homely illustrations. It is science without the forms of it.

"This lucid simplicity has often led readers to undervalue Paley as a thinker; it not only produces the effect of a perfectly translucent medium, which the more clearly it lets us see objects the less it obtrudes itself upon us; it is like a pure stream which refracts the light so perfectly as always to seem to the eye more shallow than it is.

"There is a natural correspondence between the mental and moral characteristics of men; so it was with Paley. His intellect was neither profound nor subtle; and accordingly his sympathies were circumscribed. He was also without enthusiasm; and there was, in consequence, little elevation of sentiment and no vehemence of passion about him."

The above estimate of Paley's mind—to which Mr. Rogers adds a hearty and just tribute to the benevolence of his character and the cheerfulness of his disposition—explains the unequal value of his works. Their respective dates also attest the comparative crudeness of the least satisfactory and the maturity of the most so.

First in order for the student comes the *Natural Theology*, published in 1802, only three years before his death. It is in our opinion Paley's chief, as it is his maturest, work, and that on which his characteristic fame will always chiefly rest. The charge of want of originality directed against it, might as well be brought against Newton when he infers gravitation from the falling of an apple which anybody else could see, or Priestley when he discovers oxygen which everybody breathes. The originality is not in the things or the facts, but in the inferences drawn from them, the use made of them. As Mr. Rogers says:

"The merit of Paley's work is that of having wrought materials open to everybody into a beautiful fabric; and to blame him that his materials were got from other quarters, is much as if it were charged upon a great architect that his stone was not of his own quarrying, nor his bricks of his own burning. . . . . Considering the entire character of the man's intellect, it is about the last meanness of which we should suspect him."

Of the execution of this work, Mr. Rogers writes,—and we quite agree with his estimate, remembering our own youth when we read both novels and natural theology:

"Such is the skill with which the *Natural Theology* is planned and executed, such the felicitous selection and disposition of the materials, so apt are the examples and illustrations, so luminous the expression, that to a youth of intelligence few novels are more interesting. Paley's survey of the ground too, and the limits within which he resolved to construct, shew great logical sagacity. Clearly seeing that if the immensely varied and complicated 'adaptations' of the universe can be shewn to have originated in conscious intelligence, it will be difficult not to grant all the concessions which theism asks for; he avoids all the

darker, especially the so-called *a-priori* methods, though freely leaving any such methods open to those who choose to employ them or who can profit by them. He therefore bends his chief energies to exhibit the indications of *design* in the universe, and for this purpose nothing can be more judicious than his choice of examples."

It has been the fashion with some recent critics to find fault with Paley's argument from *design*. "Contrivance," "expedients," "mechanism," "compensation," "package," and all such terms, used by him to describe graphically the facts of animal or vegetable structure, and suggesting the idea of Mind as necessarily involved in their origination, are fastidiously regarded as degrading the Deity "into a Mechanic." It is easy to find fault with a writer's arguments if we begin with misrepresenting and burlesquing them. The reply, not only on behalf of Paley, but of all who have argued an intelligent Author from the marks of intelligent design in the creation, of course is,—

"That it is a mere misinterpretation of the obvious meaning of these writers. All they mean to assert is, that there must be power and intelligence in the Supreme Cause of all, proportioned to the production of the phenomena ascribed to him; just as there must be in man proportioned to the phenomena of *his* power and intelligence. But though in expressing this they necessarily use figurative language derived from the analogy of man's nature, they plainly do not intend to imply that the *modes* in which wisdom and intelligence on the part of God and man are respectively exerted or manifested are the same; or that what is *long sought*, laborious and successive in man's mind is at all so in God's. And as this is the meaning of these writers, and their sole meaning, so it may be doubted whether there ever was an atheist who really misunderstood it."

Among the suggested improvements of the Natural Theology argument, the one of highest pretensions is that ascribed to Kant, and (strange to say) popularized by two such opposite theologians as A. Coquerel* and Theodore Parker:† "The human mind has the idea of God; *therefore* God is." Otherwise, it is argued, there would be a faculty without a corresponding object. And why not? says the atheist. The argument can only be addressed to the theist, to prove to him the Divine existence from what he already believes of the Divine perfections! Never was such an obviously circular argument. The only difficulty is in thinking that it should ever have imposed on minds reputed logical. We cannot give up Paley's argument from design, to adopt any such tempting short-cut to theology as this. In reference to it and to other recent suggestions for a less argumentative theology, Mr. Rogers well says:

"Some theists complain that Paley does not take *other* methods—that he does not do *this*, that he does not do *that;* that he does not appeal to man's moral instincts, to his intuitive convictions of a Deity, sense of

* Christologie, chap. xv. † Disc. of Religion, chap. ii.

the infinite, and so on; that he is busy rather about the 'means and machinery' by which the Deity works than the 'ends for which he works;' that he is more busy about the 'reasons of belief' than 'the object of faith;' with much more to the same purpose, or rather to no purpose; for surely the question ought to be, not what a theist can accept as a sufficient dissertation on the Divine existence and perfections, but what an atheist will find it most difficult to evade; nor, again, whether a theist may not prefer another line of argument for himself, but whether he can suggest any which an atheist will find it less difficult to understand and embrace; in other words, whether Paley does what he intends to do; and whether what he intends to do be, with *reference to those whom he addresses*, the best adapted to produce a conviction of the existence of a personal Intelligence that has constructed and presides over the universe. If man can be brought to admit his argument, that one admission will pave the way for every other involved in the ordinary theory of theism." . . . .

"Some say there is no better way in this controversy than that of appealing at once to a direct intuitive consciousness of an infinite God. But what if atheists deny that they have any such? What if they affirm that if there be any such voice within, it is by itself a whisper or inarticulate? What if the majority even of theists say that such whispers are confirmations when made distinct, but are not first headgrounds of conviction? What if they say that their convictions are so far dependent, at the very outset, on this question of the 'order' of the universe, that supposing confusion reigned in the natural world while the mind retained all its present powers (were that possible), they doubt whether any 'intuitions' they have would have satisfied them of the existence of a Deity, or even induced the faintest suspicion of one?"

The next of Paley's works (in the student's order) is the *Evidences of Christianity*. It was published in 1794, when the author was fifty-one years of age. This work is, of course, no more original in its historical facts than the *Natural Theology* in its scientific ones. But in the manner in which they are brought to bear upon his argument, there is the same strong individuality of thought as in the *Theology*. He continually acknowledges his obligations to Lardner, Douglass and others. In those parts which have to deal with testimony, we see the characteristic acuteness of a thoroughly *legal* mind, which had led the boy William Paley to act the Lancaster assizes over again among his schoolfellows at Giggleswick, and had carried the youth from the neighbourhood of Ripon to York to hear the trial of Eugene Aram, whom he afterwards described as "a man who has got himself hanged by his own cleverness" in his defence.

We have never thought the formal and ostensible distribution of Paley's *Evidences* either happy or remarkably lucid; but it is a strange mistake to charge it with omitting all reference to the *internal* evidences of Christianity. These are embraced under the "auxiliary evidences" in Part ii., and some of them are developed in a very striking manner. Paley's division of his subject is as follows:

Preparatory Considerations, especially the question of the Antecedent Credibility of Miracles.

Part i. The direct Historical Evidence of Christianity, and wherein it is distinguished from the Evidence alleged for other Miracles.

Part ii. The Auxiliary Evidences of Christianity, including the *internal.*

Part iii. Consideration of Objections.

So far the division is clear and intelligible; though some might prefer that of *external* and *internal* evidence, which would have embraced nearly the same topics as his first and second Parts respectively. But his direct historical evidence (forming Part i.) is made to look needlessly hard and formal and somewhat repulsive by the useless obtrusion, at the head of each chapter, of his "Proposition 1, That there is satisfactory evidence that many, professing to be original witnesses of the Christian miracles, passed their lives in labours, dangers and sufferings," &c.; or his "Proposition 2, That there is NOT satisfactory evidence" in regard to "other similar miracles." These two propositions are, we believe, fully proved by Paley; but we scarcely feel that this is the whole issue of the historical question, and it is impossible to pretend that each chapter as it occurs demonstrates afresh the again repeated proposition. They may all, directly or indirectly, bear upon it; but each of them leaves upon the mind a varied and a wider impression of the thing proved, and of the thing to be proved, than is expressed in that recurrent formula. This at least has been our own feeling from our earliest acquaintance with Paley's *Evidences,*—that he fully proves his first proposition respecting Christianity, but also proves a great deal more that is far more interesting and important to us as going to form our conception of Christianity and its evidences. This criticism, it is true, applies merely to the *form* of the book; but we admit that its form is in this respect unprepossessing, and by no means sufficiently describes the subject or its treatment. How fully Paley has illustrated his subject, and how little he has left to be added, we may judge from the Archbishop of Dublin's new edition of the book. A good Introduction vindicates the sufficiency of Paley's book for the argumentative position of the Christian evidences in our day:

"The truth is, that against the substance of Christianity itself, as distinguished from human perversions of it, modern infidelity—however it may boast of new discoveries—has nothing more to say than has been said and refuted a thousand times. It may seem to present a terrible form in the obscurity which German metaphysics have thrown round it; but upon a nearer view, the spectre will resolve itself into the old worn-out clothes of Collins, and Toland, and Chubb, and Hume, which are now too soiled and threadbare to be exhibited openly in the day-light." (Int. p. 2).

Whately has a salutary word for another class of persons who acknowledge the use and necessity of the study of Christian evidences, but "dislike and deplore that necessity," viewing the matter "somewhat as any person of humane disposition does the arming and training of soldiers." "All attention to the subject is connected in their minds with the idea of *doubt*, which they feel to be painful and dread as something sinful."

"Far different (he says) are men's feelings in reference to any person or thing that they really do greatly value and admire, when they have a full and firm conviction. No one in ordinary life considers it disagreeable to mark and dwell on the constantly recurring proofs of the excellent and admirable qualities of some highly valued friend."

"So also in what is called Natural Theology—the proofs of the wisdom, goodness and power of God—how delightful to a pious mind is the contemplation of the evidence which it presents!"

"It is not for the refutation of objectors merely, and for the conviction of doubters, that it is worth while to study in this manner, with the aid of such a guide as Paley, the two volumes—that of Nature and that of Revelation—which Providence has opened before us, but because it is both profitable and gratifying to a well-constituted mind to trace in each of them the evident handwriting of Him, the Divine Author of both."

We might be disappointed, except as feeling that it reflects credit upon our Paley, to find how little of real importance the Archbishop of Dublin has added in his "Annotations." Occasionally he defines a little more precisely some careless expression of Paley's; but he corrects or alters little, and adds less. We are amused to find him twice perplexing himself as to whether the Epistle of Barnabas was by "Barnabas the apostle" or by some other Barnabas (pp. 90 and 367), not having been aware ourselves that there was such an apostle, and having been content, with Paley, to speak of "Barnabas, the companion of Paul," as the author of the Epistle in question, and to regard it, with Paley, as "probably genuine." The good Archbishop suggests a whimsical argument (which we think Paley can do without) for the genuineness of the New Testament books, from there being in them "no liturgies, creeds or other formularies," which he thinks there would have been, had not "the apostles and their attendants been *super*naturally restrained from drawing up any such written records." We trust more to the natural than the *super*natural suggestion here. There is the fact that they did not draw up such creeds; and from this fact we are content to conclude that creeds are post-apostolical. But some of the Archbishop's observations are timely enough; as this, in connection with the revivalist and other pretensions:

"Thus it is that presumptuous and unwise Christians prepare the way for the inroads of that covert infidelity, which by making *every* thing miraculous, makes, in fact, *nothing* miraculous, and virtually destroys the whole character of inspiration by making it universal. A

king would be virtually dethroned, if all his subjects were elevated to regal power."—P. 201.

We must add Mr. Rogers's estimate of the undiminished value of Paley's Evidences:

"It is the fashion with infidelity now-a-days to speak of Paley's 'Evidences' as *passé;* as having little or no relation to present controversies; and as utterly inadequate to meet those more subtle and more efficient methods of refuting the truth of Christianity which modern astuteness has discovered. This is a stock fallacy with many infidel writers; and by mere repetition it has among the young and ignorant often passed current. We maintain, on the contrary, that the supposed new methods differ from the old more in form than substance; and that when they differ in form they do not affect the substance of the argument. Almost everything in the new methods that has any real bearing on the controversy has been long since propounded to the world. Nor, if we reflect, could it well be otherwise. An *asserted historic fact* is not like a Chinese puzzle capable of being put together in a thousand ways. Christianity professes to be *historically* true, and the only way it could be shewn *not* to be so is to shew that its alleged facts are no facts at all. Now the *mode* of doing this admits of no great choice; changes of form or detail there may be, but there can be little more." (Mr. Rogers illustrates this position in some detail.) "The infidel hypotheses as to the origin of Christianity are indeed various, and, unhappily for its opponents, very contradictory; but the arguments by which it is attempted to prove its unhistoric character are necessarily the same.

"Thus it is not easy to see that the *a-priori* argument for the incredibility of all external revelation, based on the modern 'spiritual deism,' differs essentially from Lord Herbert's old-fashioned argument founded on his natural deism; nor does it matter, though the one calls the responses of the internal oracle 'spiritual intuitions,' and the other 'innate ideas.' There is plenty of scope for a 'revelation,' as human nature is now constituted, in confirmation or rectification of either; for never, judging by results, was any oracle less oracular." . . . .

"Paley's work is still a sufficient answer to the generality of modern arguments against Christianity. Even Paulus and Strauss, so far as Christianity is really assailed by any argument which attempts to prove its unhistoric character, infuse the old methods; as for their own hypotheses, utterly contradictory by the way, for accounting for its origin in defiance of history, Paley of course never dreamt of them; nor is it a matter of much consequence, for they are just becoming (one of them has become) a by-word and laughing-stock in Germany itself. Not only are they so incoherent with each other, but they imply such a dreadful compression and torture of the understanding of any reasonable creature who attempts to believe that either does really give the rationale of the Christianity of the New Testament,—both so aggravate the difficulties of its origin, supposing it to be what they make it,—that there is not one man out of a thousand who would not sooner receive the entire New Testament, or reject it entire, than submit to the humiliation and bondage of such exegesis. It is often perfectly ludicrous, even as applied to single passages; but to go through the whole New Testament, reading plain narratives backwards or crosswise, or any way except the plain

way—dissolving facts into mistakes and myths—is beyond all human patience." (Mr. Rogers illustrates his case by taking the history of Paul's conversion and analyzing the rationalistic mode of accounting for it.)

There is one subject on which Paley's *Evidences* might with advantage be annotated up to the improved state of theological criticism, but which the Archbishop has left as he found it. We mean the fulfilment of the Old Testament prophecies in the events of the New. Paley introduces only one instance, and that the most striking, namely Isaiah lii. 13, liii. But he gives us to understand that there are many similar ones, and does not hint the nearer and more simply national applicability of the Messianic prophecies in general. This might be difficult ground for an Archbishop to tread, but it needs to be carefully trodden by any inquirer into the *Evidences*. Paley's argument from our Lord's prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem needs no qualification or addition.

After the Evidences of Christianity, the *Horæ Paulinæ* is the next of Paley's volumes, in student's order, as teaching how to read the Scriptures intelligently. It appeared in 1790. It is no disparagement to the merits of this book that it has never attained the same *popularity* as his other writings. The Latin title on the back sends the mere English reader on to the next adjoining volume; or, if the book be opened and the explanatory addition be read on the title-page, "*Horæ Paulinæ*, or the Truth of the Scripture History of St. Paul evinced," still this is not attractive, nor even explanatory of the real nature and real charm of the book. The general reader thinks it is the investigation of some minute and insignificant theological points; and even the theologian does not guess what it really is till he has read in the first chapter the "Exposition of the Argument," or been directed (as is the general case) to its valuable and intensely interesting contents. All students know how to estimate its worth.

"The *Horæ Paulinæ* is the work of Paley which displays most originality. . . . . It is felicitous thought felicitously wrought out. There is indeed a pregnant passage of Doddridge in which he speaks of the reciprocal support which the undesigned coincidences between the Acts and the Epistles give to the historic credibility of both; and another still more general, in the *Pensées* of Pascal, hinting a similar thought in relation to the Gospels; but there is no proof that Paley saw either; while the extraordinary sagacity with which he has dragged latent coincidences from their hiding-places, and shewn correspondence where none before had suspected it, is all his own. If he had seen such hints, it would as little have abated his claims to originality as the striking passage from Origen, prefixed to the *Analogy*, detracts from Butler's. But it was honest, as Sir J. Mackintosh says, in Butler to place it there; and if Paley had really had his work suggested by the passage in Doddridge, one would hope that he would have done the like."

We come last to the first-written of Paley's chief works, his *Moral and Political Philosophy*. It is the least satisfactory of them to the largest number of theologians and moralists in the present day. Archbishop Whately's office in re-editing it has been chiefly to object and protest, and to correct his author's positions. That it has long been used, and still is, as a text-book at Cambridge, is the Archbishop's chief reason for annotating it. He says, "I am far from thinking that Paley's work ought not to be *one* of the text-books employed. But the study of it should be accompanied with cautions to the young student against adopting the whole of his system." He has oddly confined himself to the first volume, that is, to the first three books, which do not, however (as his Preface seems to imply), constitute the intire work on Moral Philosophy, and merely omit the Political; for they carry us only through the *Relative Duties*, and leave untouched the *Duties to Ourselves* (Book iv.), and *Duties towards God* (Book v.), as well as the *Elements of Political Knowledge* which form Book vi. A not over-candid critic on Paley and his annotator, in a book lately noticed by us,* suggests that the latter was anxious to avoid having to comment on Paley's doctrine of Establishments which is propounded in the latter half of his work. That "Dr. Whately appears to have annotated his author out of all credit" in what he has done to the Moral Philosophy, is true enough. But as the Archbishop has not shirked the chapter on Subscription to Articles, we cannot see how he should have been afraid of that on Establishments. He is quite Paleyan on the former, and might probably have shewn himself equally so on the latter. But he is far in advance in proposing to abolish oaths and make marriage a civil institution. He overturns Paley's ethical system itself to its very foundation; if it be not more correct to say, he shews that it is absolutely destitute of foundation. And we can only suppose he was tired of his task when half through the work of objecting.

No one, we think, can fail to be struck with the great inferiority of this work to all the rest of Paley's in precision of thought. The opening sentence, professedly containing a *definition* of the science, is eminently loose and unscientific, and we wonder how the Archbishop of Dublin could pass it by without castigation: "Moral Philosophy, Morality, Ethics, Casuistry, Natural Law, mean all the same thing; namely, *that science which teaches men their duty and the reasons of it.*" Pity that there are so many terms for the same thing! But is it so? Is not moral philosophy the *science* of duty, and morality the *practice*, and ethics (or morals) *sometimes the science and sometimes the practice;* and is not casuistry a very small *part of the science* (namely, that of difficult and doubtful cases); and is not natural

* The Ultimate Principle of Religious Liberty. 1860.

law *one part of the foundation* of both science and practice, in *contradistinction* to revealed law, which is another part? We do not here affect the precision of definition, but have marked at once half-a-dozen distinctions in the meanings of the terms called synonymous by Paley. Then in his third paragraph he says, "The rules of life by which men are ordinarily governed" are, "the law of honour, the law of the land and the Scriptures." Where the Scriptures are unknown, then, is there no rule of life but honour and the law of the land? Is there no such thing as conscience? In his chapter on the Moral Sense, Paley distinctly says *there is not;* though at the end of his fourth chapter he had said that "the Scriptures commonly presuppose in the persons to whom they speak, a knowledge of the principles of natural justice; and are employed not so much to teach *new* rules of morality, as to enforce the practice of it by *new* sanctions and by a *greater certainty*." His denial of the existence of the moral sense as a faculty of the human being, is quite inconsistent with such a passage as the above, and with the consciousness of most persons who reason on their own spiritual constitution. But there is no denying that Paley's philosophy really endeavours to do without admitting a *moral sense*. Those who would vindicate him against himself may think he has said more than he meant; that he only meant to deny its absoluteness of instinct; that from its endless varieties and contradictions, he was led to repudiate such a doctrine of conscience as would make it an absolute, complete and infallible instinct. Against this kind of doctrine of conscience Paley *does* level his arguments; but in its place he certainly says there is no moral faculty at all, while yet he assumes one in such passages as that just quoted about the Scriptures presupposing a knowledge of natural justice. Upon this dilemma his annotator fixes him often enough. It is indeed conceivable that Paley meant no more than to deny that the moral faculty is a distinct and separate faculty from the other intellectual and emotional powers. If so, who shall assure us that it is separate? Why do we need a separate faculty for judging of right and wrong, from that which judges of all other relations and distinctions? No doubt the idea or sentiment of right and wrong is perfectly distinct from and unlike all other ideas and sentiments. But so is the idea of number distinct from and unlike that of colour; the ideas of space, causation, time, &c., are utterly unlike each other; and the sentiments and passions, again, are various and different enough from each other; yet we do not maintain (unless we be craniologists) that there is a separate faculty for each class of ideas and sentiments. No more need there be a *separate* intellect or sensibility for the conscience, which is the common intellect and sensibility applied to questions of right and wrong. If Paley meant this, however, he ought to have said it, and both his followers and opponents would have understood him

better. We are disposed to think he meant something of this kind (though he could hardly have a clear meaning when using such loose phraseology), rather than that he really and distinctly meant to deny the existence of a faculty capable of the sentiment of moral right and wrong.

Equally unsatisfactory are his definitions of Virtue as "*the doing good to mankind, in obedience to the will of God and for the sake of everlasting happiness;*"* and of Obligation as "*a violent motive resulting from the command of another;*" and his distinction between Prudence and Duty, "*that in the one case we consider what we shall gain or lose in the present world: in the other case we consider what we shall gain or lose in the world to come.*" Such definitions are a libel even upon the utilitarian system of morals, of which Paley is often regarded as a leading expounder.

We account for the inferiority of the *Moral Philosophy* to Paley's other productions, not merely by the subject being one for which his mind was less fitted, but also by the very early period of his life to which the book may virtually be assigned. When he was only twenty-seven years old, he became one of the tutors of Christ's College, in which capacity "he lectured on metaphysics, morals and the Greek Testament." Here was the embryo of his Moral and Political Philosophy. This occupation continued for nine years, giving opportunity certainly for the frequent review and gradual modification, or even the renouncement of his earliest system of ethics, if the lecturer's mind had found *its real strength* in the direction of these studies. But such repetition may, *under opposite conditions*, tend merely to stereotype the first edition of a man's thoughts. And this we suppose to have been the case with Paley's *Moral Philosophy*, which was taught by him orally from his twenty-eighth year, and though not published till 1785 (his forty-second year), yet was published, we believe, at that time, with little or no improvement derived from deeper or maturer thought.

The *practical* character of Paley's mind seems, almost consciously, to have narrowed his field of view as a philosophical moralist. He says in his preface: "In pursuing the principle of morals through the detail of cases to which it is applicable, I have had in view to *accommodate* [the emphasis is ours] both the choice of the subjects and the manner of handling them to the situations which arise in the life of an inhabitant of this country in these times." To *apply* great principles to our national and local circumstances would be an important part of *political* philosophy; but the *moral* would stand a great chance of being narrowed and lowered by keeping such a purpose in view. Paley's system is certainly very *accommodating*.

* This definition was adopted from his patron the Bishop of Carlisle. (Meadley, p. 79.)

The considerations above suggested enable us—and we suggest them principally with that view—to retain our confidence in Paley's best and maturest works, for which his *acuteness* of mind peculiarly fitted him, though disavowing altogether his worst, most crude and ill-digested work, for the subject of which he wanted *depth of reasoning power and moral perception.*

To the embryo period of his Moral Philosophy belongs his famous (or infamous) *mot*, that "he could not afford to keep a conscience." The following is Mr. Meadley's account of it:

"The great controversy on the propriety of requiring a subscription to articles of faith, as practised by the Church of England, excited at this time a very strong sensation amongst the members of the two Universities. At Oxford, the principles of the High-Church party were completely triumphant, scarcely one opposing whisper being heard. But at Cambridge, the discussion exercised talents and ingenuity on both sides of the question, attended with no small asperity. Mr. Paley, though personally attached to many of the reforming party, and from the known liberality of his sentiments considered favourable to their claims, *did not sign* the clerical petition for relief which was presented to the House of Commons in 1772, alleging jocularly to Mr. Jebb, as an apology for his refusal, that 'he could not afford to keep a conscience.'"

The joke, we have always felt, was sober earnest. *Ridentem dicere verum, quid vetat?* Mr. Rogers makes no better of the matter for Paley's credit by saying in effect that the conscience he kept was of a very obtuse and low order:

"He *did* keep a conscience; but it is impossible to help feeling that a want of due sensitiveness, a certain moral laxity on some occasions, was the consistent fruit of a moral theory which necessarily turns the thoughts too closely on the 'profit and loss,' the advantages and disadvantages of actions, and invites to a too solicitous casuistry whenever it is not absolutely shameless to exercise it."

Paley was, in fact, a "Broad Churchman" by anticipation, differing from other Broad Churchmen of his day by *not* desiring relief from subscription. Another anecdote is characteristic. In 1662 (his twentieth year), when he had proposed to defend two theses, the one *against capital punishments*, the other *against the eternity of hell torments*, Dr. Thomas, the head of his College, "objected in strong terms to both his questions, but insisted upon his relinquishing the last. Mr. Paley immediately went to the moderator and acquainted him with this peremptory command. Mr. Watson was indignant that 'the heads of Colleges should interfere in a matter which belonged solely (as he said) to him; for he was the judge of the propriety or impropriety of the questions sent to him.' 'Are you, Sir (continued he) independent of your College? If you are, these shall be the questions for your *act*.' Mr. Paley told him that 'he should be sorry to offend the College, and therefore wished to change the last question.' 'Very well (replied the moderator); the best

way then to satisfy the scruples of these gentlemen will be for you to defend the eternity of hell torments;' ***which, changing his thesis to the affirmative, he actually did.***" (Meadley, p. 19.) As on this occasion he was ready to take either side of the question, so on the question of subscription to articles he actually did take both sides in turn. His plea for lax subscription is well known. It stands in his Moral Philosophy as he taught it in his College lectures; and consistently with it he refused to sign a petition for relief. But the Bishop of Carlisle having published his "Considerations on the Propriety of requiring Subscription" (in favour of its abolition), and Dr. Randolph having "answered" the Considerations, Paley, in 1774, published a *Defence of the Considerations*, in which he virtually answers all his own arguments for lax subscription, and urges the need of relaxation for the sake alike of honour and intellect. This "Defence" of the Bishop's "Considerations" was published anonymously, and though ascribed by many to Paley, was more generously denied by others to be his; but his son states in a note (Life, p. 73) that he has now by him authority enough to say decidedly that this pamphlet *was* the production of Mr. Paley. The son does not seem to perceive the moral inconsistency here involved; but represents him as engaging in the controversy "so far as to answer an attack made on Bishop Law, his friend's father;" speaks of it as "a young performance, which was not made the vehicle for grave opinion, and which reflects more on the tone of his opponent than conveys any additional information or sentiment;" and stands by his father on the "chapter on Subscription," which, at least in substance, "he was using in his lectures at the very time." Could inconsistency be more sharply pointed out? What does a true moral sense—if, in spite of Paley's denial, there be such a thing among men—pronounce upon this case?

We conclude this too long article with judgments worth weighing.

Mr. Meadley, no uncandid biographer, says:

"Mr. Paley's casuistry in this instance, on the nature and extent of the obligation incurred, may be most effectually answered by his own better reasoning on the propriety of subscription, in his *Defence of Bishop Law's Considerations*, and in his chapter *Of Religious Establishments and of Toleration.*"

Mr. Meadley quotes a letter of Mrs. Jebb's, in which she says:

"Dr. Jebb, who, after he left the University, still retained his respect and friendship for him, and myself were both sorry that he did not express himself so strongly in his *Moral Philosophy* against subscription to the Articles, as from his real principles we might have expected."

Dr. Disney, in a note to Jebb's works (quoted also by Meadley), says of those opposite publications:

"In the *one case* he seems to betray the yoke of bondage, in the display of a very feeble apology; in the *other* he resumes somewhat more of his Christian liberty, and recollects the principles of his Protestant faith."

And what said Gilbert Wakefield?—"this Dissenting Wakefield," as Paley the son names him, without feeling that Dissent was Wakefield's practical self-sacrifice to his "Considerations on Subscription," and sneering at his "very equivocal bashfulness exhibited so boldly and intemperately." Gilbert Wakefield, nearly contemporary with Paley, who estimated the Moral Philosophy more highly than we do as an excellent summary, "notwithstanding some weak and some erroneous principles," speaks the natural sentiments of high honour which his own life from Cambridge to Dorchester gaol illustrated:

"I blush for him, I blush for this degradation of my species, when I see a man like *Dr. Paley*, of great worth and talents, and whose sentiments, from their general diffusion, must be so important to society—when I see that author stain the pages of his incomparable book with such a shuffling chapter on *Subscription to Articles of Religion*. He has amply gratified the most sanguine expectations of his friends, by the extraordinary powers of his penetrating and comprehensive understanding, and the glory of his *academical career*. But has he, in this instance, acted up to the general simplicity and honesty of his character?" (Wakefield's Memoirs, I. 129.)

Was it intemperate of Gilbert Wakefield to quote Joseph Mede's saying: "*There is more goes to persuasion than reasons or demonstrations, and that is not in my power*"?

SCRIPTURAL HYMN. By SIR JOHN BOWRING.

(Psalm cxix. 54.)

The sweetest song that music brings
When harmony is blent with awe,
Is that, all-loving God! which sings
Thy statutes, Thy benignant law.

What sweeter songs could e'er engage
The silent thought, the uttering voice,
Or fill life's passing pilgrimage
With lovelier light or holier joys?

These songs, when sanctified by Thee,
Are echoes from heaven's harps above,
Foretastes of immortality,
Dawns of celestial light and love.

The song which to divinest things
The captivated spirit draws,
Is that, all-loving God! which sings
Thy statutes, Thy benignant laws.

GEORGE HARRIS: A MEMOIR.

Chapter VI.

THE SCOTCH MISSION.

A MAP of Scotland conveys the only true representation of the field of Mr. Harris's Scotch missionary operations. They were spread over the whole length and breadth of the land. It may be said, in general terms, that wherever throughout the country any marked activity existed, he found materials on which he worked. Cities and villages, places of manufacturing industry and of scholastic repute, were alike invaded by him. It mattered not whether his audiences were great or small, or his adherents rich or poor, he was always ready to adapt himself to the varied circumstances under which his cause might be promoted. It mattered not how far he had to travel or what difficulties he had to encounter, where his presence was needed he would be sure to appear at the fitting time, uplifting his testimony. The stronger the opposition offered to him, the greater was his inducement to discharge the duty he had the opportunity to perform. "The efforts I have made," he said on one occasion in Glasgow, "were prompted by the feeling that, placed in the situation I deem it my high privilege to occupy, I was not merely the minister of this individual society, but bound, by obligations the most sacred, to consider myself the advocate of despised and unpopular truth, wherever and whenever an opening could be found to declare the right and expose the wrong." Sometimes his efforts were called forth by the fact, that in the localities he visited there were individuals who sympathized more or less with his opinions; and at other times he was led to these localities by hearing of virulent attacks upon his opinions which were there made. The kindly invitation of the friend, and the fierce denunciation of the foe, however different might be the feelings they excited, were met by him with an equal sense of obligation.

It was his custom, whenever possible, to connect his public ministrations with a celebration of the Lord's Supper, and also to unite together in a worshiping society those who were willing to make public profession of the Unitarian faith. He thus carefully attended to the distinctively religious interests of the persons who might be attracted by his theological expositions, and provided for the permanent establishment and growth of the influence he originated. He considered himself the pastor of each community which he thus formed, and was so considered by its members. He drew up its rules, watched over its interests, supplied its wants, conducted its business, and was personally acquainted with all the individuals composing it, as though he lived on the spot. Even when another minister took charge of any of these stations, he, as a matter of course, retained the over-

sight of the work. He was justly entitled to the appellation of "Unitarian Bishop" by which he was not unfrequently called. The honour in which he was held by all the professors of liberal Christianity in Scotland was singularly great. No one else was or could be compared with him. He stood alone in an estimation which one has well expressed by saying, "All the brethren all but worshiped him." "Up to this hour," says another, "the very mention of his name refreshes me." The contrast between the fear and hatred with which he was regarded by one class of the population and the enthusiastic admiration which was felt toward him by another was very striking, and truly descriptive both of the man and his position.

In order to promote the interest of this missionary work, he re-established the Scotch Unitarian Association. This occurred in July, 1830. We have seen that he was one of the main instruments in originating this institution so early as 1813. Since 1824, its operations had been discontinued; but new opportunities uniting with new zeal to require its agency, it was called again into use. The vigour with which it started afresh on its course was greater than it had ever before displayed, and it continued to increase in efficiency from year to year. The annual meetings of this body attracted the professors of Unitarianism from all parts of the land, and gave impulse to every effort that could be made by them for their common cause. When they who thus assembled together saw each other, they "thanked God and took courage." In reading the reports of these meetings, I have been deeply impressed with the substantial value of the matter brought forward at them from year to year. Great pains were taken to render them as effective as possible, and some of their transactions will remain among the most memorable manifestations of the Unitarian community.

During some portion of its continuance, this Association employed a missionary agent, whose business it was to travel from station to station sustaining the interests which had been created, and to break up fresh ground wherever possible. The Rev. Henry Clarke filled this situation from March, 1832, to November, 1834. Mr. Clarke's incessant labour and indomitable perseverance in the work he undertook demand a special notice. Taking Glasgow as the centre of his circuit, his preaching places varied from eight to fifty miles in distance, and his journeys to these places were almost always performed on foot. He had previously acted as a missionary in Lancashire, and was exceedingly well adapted for that kind of service. He was afterwards settled as the minister of Dundee, and from thence removed to Chorley.

At the time of the re-establishment of the Association, the only places in Scotland which had Unitarian ministers settled in them were Edinburgh and Glasgow; but whilst it was in opera-

tion, such settlements were effected in Dundee, Greenock, Aberdeen, Paisley and Tillicoultry. An attempt was made in 1837 to establish a second Unitarian congregation in Glasgow, under the ministry of the Rev. R. Jackson, who had given up the charge of an Independent Relief congregation in that city on account of a renunciation of orthodox opinions; but though the enterprize commenced under the most favourable auspices, it was not eventually successful. The ministers in all these places acted as missionaries, and in addition to them a considerable number of individuals were engaged in the same work, partly consisting of laymen who thus supplemented their ordinary employments, and partly of students in the Glasgow University who were preparing for the ministry. I am not able to construct a complete list of the persons who thus co-operated with Mr. Harris from time to time; but it is only due to those whose names have come prominently before me that I should mention them as they occur to my recollection. In this honourable band, then, were to be found B. T. Stannus, R. E. B. Maclellan, A. Macdonald, H. Giles, J. Cropper, J. Hope, W. M'Kean, G. H. Wells, D. Lloyd, C. Wicksteed, W. A. Jones, H. Clarke, James Forrest, T. Cooper, D. G. Coghill, C. Dunlop, T. Bradshaw, P. Callender and M. Scott.

Mr. Harris, as Secretary of the Association, conducted a correspondence with societies or individuals representing about sixty towns and villages in which the Unitarian element existed in more or less efficiency; and, besides undergoing the labour of this correspondence, the Christian Pioneer, already alluded to, was issued by him every month, involving in itself an amount of labour which might be thought sufficient to task all the literary energy which one in his circumstances could have at command. It would be unfair to judge this publication by any other standard than that supplied by the wants of the mission whose organ it was; and judged by that standard, a high commendation must be given to it. It gave all the information that was required; it grappled with every difficulty that turned up; and it offered the exhortations and encouragements which were calculated to keep up to the highest pitch the zeal of those among whom it circulated.

To exhibit more fully the character of this missionary work in which Mr. Harris was engaged, I will give a brief account of one or two of the adventures into which it led him.

Carluke is a town in Lanarkshire a few miles distant from Lanark itself, whose inhabitants, at the time I have to refer to, were employed in weaving stockings and cotton goods. As early as 1826, Mr. Harris delivered lectures there, and in October of that year an Unitarian society was formed in the place. Near Carluke, on a wild and comparatively uninhabited spot, called Davies-Dikes Moor, stood an old meeting-house, probably the

first erected on this side of the Forth by persons connected with that Secession from the Kirk, which was headed by the Erskines and took place in the first half of the last century. It was nearly equidistant from numerous towns and villages, but it had been for some time deserted on account of the erection of another Secession place of worship in a more populous part of the district. The chapel and the locality in which it stood were, however, considered sacred by reason of the assertion of religious liberty with which, as understood by the Secessionists, they were associated. Though the theology by which this Secession was characterised was very widely different from that of Unitarianism, the liberty of thought handed down in connection with it prepared the way in this, and in some other instances besides, both for a change of doctrinal opinion and a profession of the change when experienced. It is not only true that Unitarianism and religious freedom are very closely allied, but that a sympathy with freedom is more favourable to Unitarian interests than a mere agreement of doctrine is. Such agreement is indeed but of little effect where ecclesiastical submission is regarded with indifference. It was resolved by the Carluke congregation that if possible they would hold a Sunday service in a little glen upon the moor, which was close to the old meeting-house. Mr. Harris was asked to conduct the worship on the occasion, and he did so, Sunday, June 10, 1827, preaching two sermons, that were afterwards combined in one for publication and issued under the title of *The Progress of Reformation.* The sermons contained a powerful appeal in favour of carrying out to its legitimate theological extent the liberty to whose bold assertion, in times gone by, the place was consecrated. A large congregation was assembled; the Carluke congregation being joined by friends from Glasgow, Airdrie, Kirk of Shotts, Orbiston, Holytown, Hamilton, Lanark, Wishawtown, &c. The day was delightful, and the influence exerted by the preacher and the scene such as was never likely to be forgotten by those who witnessed it. A gentleman who was present at this celebration thus describes the part he took in it: "I was first introduced to Mr. Harris the day before the Davies-Dykes-Moor sermon was preached. I was going to drive in that direction, and I took him with me from Glasgow. The service was a most gratifying display. He preached in a circular hollow, and we all sat upon the grass. You will have read the sermon. I think nothing could have been better chosen—more suitable and telling—for the place and occasion. He certainly was the right man to address a mixed audience. He had the taste and ability to produce what was most effective, and, though sometimes fierce enough, was seldom otherwise than happy." The text was the 35th chapter of Isaiah, and it is worthy of being referred to by the reader for its beautiful aptitude. The Carluke congregation was principally kept up by local lay agency,

and was very frequently visited by Mr. Harris during the whole of his residence in Scotland.

Tillicoultry, in Clackmananshire, the seat of a considerable woollen manufactory, was a place to which Mr. Harris very often directed his efforts, and which was at length regularly supplied by him with preaching. One circumstance, at least, marks his labour there with special interest. He seems first to have preached in the village in 1829. Previously to his doing so, an application made on his behalf for the use of a school-room built by general subscription, was rejected at a meeting of the subscribers. The most active opponent of the application was the Rev. Archibald Browning, a Secession minister and schoolmaster in Tillicoultry. He declared that, though an advocate for free inquiry and willing to grant the use of the room to all other classes of religionists, he must specially except Unitarians from the liberty of worshiping in it. Ten years afterwards, Mr. Browning prevented a hall in Tillicoultry which was his property from being occupied by Mr. Harris, stating that when he built it he had mentally resolved that there were three purposes it should not be let for, — drinking, dancing, and Unitarian preaching. Shortly afterwards, however, he was destined to meet Mr. Harris face to face on occasion of the delivery by the latter of his lectures on Capital Punishment. This personal contact changed the current of feeling under which the opposition to Unitarianism had been offered, and a vote of thanks to the heretical champion was with marked cordiality proposed by his resolute antagonist. Time went on, and it came to pass, strangely enough, that, mainly under Mr. Harris's influence, Mr. Browning himself became a convert to Unitarianism. He ceased to be a Secession minister, but continued to preach to his old congregation, a large portion of whom still adhered to him. They did not, however, call themselves Unitarians, though their pastor was never reluctant to shew his sympathy with professed Unitarian objects. It was a strong proof of this that he admitted into his own pulpit the man whom he had endeavoured to deprive of any hearing at all. It manifested, indeed, a noble disposition on his part to brave public odium in thus making amends for the injustice he had formerly done. As Mr. Harris stood there, proclaiming doctrines from the very citadel of hostility, for attempting to introduce which into the place he had formerly been hooted and threatened with personal violence, he could not but deeply feel that a great victory had been gained. Well might he say in after years, "I am a little proud of that convert."

It was my happiness to make the acquaintance of Mr. Browning while I resided in Edinburgh. He was a man of strong sense and ardent temperament, devotedly attached to freedom in all its applications, and possessed of much talent for popular

address. In all that bore upon the defence and spread of liberal theology he took an enthusiastic interest. Within his own church "he spake as he believed" openly and boldly; but great bodily infirmity confined him almost entirely to the place where he lived. Had he been able to extend the sphere of his labour beyond this immediate locality, he would, I am convinced, have been eminently useful to the cause of Unitarian Christianity in Scotland. He once occupied my pulpit during a whole Sunday, and gave clear utterance to his altered faith. It was at great personal inconvenience that he did so; but he was desirous, at any risk, to leave behind him that testimony to his real position in the religious world. I believe this was the only time at which he appeared before a congregation formally designated Unitarian. He died on the 6th of February, 1858.

The history of the attempt to introduce Unitarianism into Stirling and its neighbourhood is full of warlike incidents. Occasional preaching in the guildhall had been permitted for a considerable time, and had met with evident success, when the Town Council interfered in the matter. The hall had been let as usual for a service by Mr. Harris, fixed for December 17th, 1839, when the Provost moved a resolution in the council meeting on the previous day, to the effect that the liberty so to employ it should be withdrawn. This motion was met by an amendment, that the hall should be granted for the next night in accordance with the agreement entered into, but should for the future be refused. The debate on this question was a curious specimen of civic wisdom. The Rev. Mr. Beith, who acted as spiritual adviser on the occasion, said, "he respected civil and religious liberty as much as any man possibly could; but it was of that religion which was based on the Saviour of men, not of that which denied the divinity of Christ." Baillie Smith "was not inclined to deal with his fellow-creatures in that way. He was not disposed to give particular countenance to Socinianism. He thought, for his part, there was little difference between them and others." Baillie Rankin thought that "the result of any interference on the part of the council would be, that a hue and cry would be raised through the town, and a great deal more mischief would be done thereby than was at all likely to ensue from the granting of the hall." The amendment was carried by a majority of three, eleven voting for and eight against it. Baillie Rankin's mournful prediction came of course to pass. A hue and cry was raised. Mr. Harris's ministrations, which were transferred to another hall, became more popular than ever; and a pamphlet he published, entitled, *Christian Unitarianism, what it is and what it is not—an Appeal to the serious and candid Inhabitants of Stirling*, had a very large circulation in the town. The motto of this pamphlet was a very pithy statement of the lesson which the local dignitaries who

had meddled with matters too high for them were forced to learn: "The subject part of mankind, in most places, might with Egyptian bondage expect Egyptian darkness too, were not the candle of the Lord set up by himself in men's minds, which it is impossible for the breath or power of man wholly to extinguish."—John Locke.

How strange it was that, in 1847, the Stirling burghs, of all the constituencies in Scotland, should have returned an Unitarian as their representative to Parliament in the person of J. B. Smith, Esq.! He was only returned after a very severe contest, and the battle at the last came to be fought on the ground of his religious opinions. In the thick of the fight the Stirling liberals remembered the man who had sustained among them the same cause as theirs in past years, and applied for assistance to Mr. Harris. He was then living in Newcastle-upon-Tyne. In a few days they received from him an address which, published anonymously, did most effective service on the side of Freedom. It was, in truth, as well composed as it was well timed, putting the case with irresistible clearness and strength; and it ranks among Mr. Harris's best productions. It was to him a renewal of his manhood in all its best strength to be thus called again into the field where he had before acquitted himself like a man.

Nearly a year after the Town Council interference, on Monday evening, October 19, 1840, Mr. Harris was to have preached in Stirling; "but every place was shut against the Unitarians, and for a season bigotry was triumphant in the royal burgh. Application was then made at St. Ninians, distant about a mile from Stirling; and one of the Unitarian friends being president of a subscription school in that place, obtained the sanction of the committee and the schoolmaster for the use of the room for that evening. Placards were accordingly issued announcing the preaching. Instantly the clergy, Established and Dissenting, became alarmed, the parents of the children were called upon and frightened, and the schoolmaster at their instigation refused the schoolroom and removed the forms. The preses, determined to resist the bigotry, obtained the keys and took possession also, replacing the seats. On reaching St. Ninians, Mr. Harris found considerable excitement had been occasioned, and that numbers of persons of all ages were assembled in the streets to offer every annoyance. The schoolmaster was insolent and threatened all manner of evil, should Mr. Harris attempt to preach. The hooting on his ascending the steps to the school-room was loud and continuous. Having entered the pulpit, Mr. Harris addressed the auditory, detailing the circumstances which had occurred, exposing the Protestant Popery which characterized the proceedings, appealing to their sense of justice and of right in the matter, but under the circumstances declining to preach, preferring to suffer wrong and to hold his peace when bigotry was rampant, at the same time

expressing his conviction that when the people returned to their right mind and really understood the meaning of Protestantism and Christianity, they would invite him to come amongst them, that this stain on their profession of the religion of liberty and love might be effaced. Immediately an individual—a stocking-weaver—stepped forward and proffered his cottage for the preaching. It was not many hundred yards off, and he should rejoice to open his door to shew his hatred of intolerance. The offer was accepted, and Mr. Harris preached to as many people as could possibly be crowded into two rooms and the entrance of the humble dwelling of this morally courageous individual. The preacher had scarcely reached Stirling after these occurrences, when a deputation called from Bannockburn to state that, having heard of the treatment he had experienced in the school-room at St. Ninians, a meeting had been held there on the instant, and the large subscription hall in the village was resolved to be placed at his disposal any night in the week, or on any future occasion. Mr. Harris afterwards preached at Bannockburn and also in Stirling, the trades hall having been engaged by his friends for twelve months for occasional meetings."

I must, however, bring this enumeration of occurrences having some interest special to themselves which marked Mr. Harris's missionary course, to a hasty conclusion. That course lay through sunshine and through shade, and its trials and triumphs were sometimes strangely balanced. If, as was literally the case in Kirkintilloch, an infuriated bigot in his sermon "doomed all Unitarians, with all who went to hear them, to hell," this more bitter hostility was sure to turn out, as it did there, to the furtherance of the misrepresented cause. If, as in the instance of Aberdeen, an amount of popularity was instantly secured that cannot be called other than wonderful, the success, as it did there, was sure to impose an amount of care and toil, the patient and energetic endurance of which was no less wonderful. Many were the instances in which human nature was too strong for the utmost virulence of theological wrath. At Dunfermline, a crowd had assembled to annoy the preacher, and a woman in it had actually furnished herself with a stone to fling at him; but on his being pointed out to her in order that she might accomplish her purpose, she suddenly dropped the stone, exclaiming, "Sic a wise-like man! Eh! what a pity he's a Unitarian!"—attaching probably to the name Unitarian, by which she had heard him called, a sense similar to that of wild beast. The honest conviction of religious duty from which Mr. Harris acted not only led him to tread the difficult path that thus lay before him undeterred by its dangers and continuously faithful to its responsibilities, but enabled him to find in the work itself a sufficient stimulus and an ample reward.

What was the effect of this strenuous and persevering mission-

ary labour, continued as it was without intermission for twenty years in Scotland? It is difficult to answer that question so as to approach the full truth, or to satisfy one's-self as to the pertinence of the answer that may be given.

Certainly the effect as to visible organization does not seem to be proportioned to the labour. In many of the places where Unitarianism bid fair to establish itself, it has no acknowledged existence; and in others the state in which it exists is apparently less flourishing than it was during the period to which we have been directing our attention.

In looking for the causes of this decline, we cannot but immediately perceive that a very large part of the previous success was dependent upon Mr. Harris's personal influence alone. It was distinctively a success which arose from his peculiar qualifications and attractions. When they were withdrawn, what was thus entirely caused by them ceased. To say this, is not to disparage the character of what was done, but to suggest that the actual result of it is to be looked for in another direction different from that of church development. It may, moreover, be conceded that Mr. Harris spread his force over too wide a field for permanent occupation. It has been thought that if he had concentrated his energies upon a few spots near at hand, greater fruit would have remained. I am not by any means convinced of this; but I am willing to grant its probability, with the understanding that, if it should appear that more powerful causes of failure made this but of comparatively little account, it must be allowed that it might have been, even on a knowledge of the whole history of the case, wiser to secure the greatest amount of that kind of effect which was undoubtedly within reach, ephemeral as it was.

Such insuperable causes there were. I do not reckon the orthodox prejudice of the people to be one of them, for I believe that might have been overcome. What I attach most importance to is the inadequacy of the means which Mr. Harris had at command for retaining the advantages he gained against the efforts of a resident and active clergy. In every parish in Scotland, one or more, and in some a large staff of men were to be found, whose office it was to resist such endeavours as he made. They were generally speaking zealous in the discharge of that office, and their constant presence with the people put instrumentalities into their hands which a stranger could not employ. The Scotch clergy, it should also be borne in mind, are much superior to the English clergy in their aptitude for meeting and repelling an heretical attack, and have much stronger support in the theological acquirements and tendencies of the people. Nothing will do the work of liberal evangelization which might and ought to be done, but such an agency as *will* plant in every locality where a favourable opening exists, an

individual capable of holding his own against the established ministry of the district. This is, to a larger degree than is commonly taken into account, the want attaching to Unitarian missions in England; but in Scotland that want is of the nature of an absolute necessity. We reason wrongly when we suppose that our occasional efforts can effect similar objects to those which the occasional efforts of Methodists or Congregationalists effect. They have only to give impulse to the generally acknowledged faith, but we have to recommend and enforce a new faith opposed to the prevalent orthodoxy; and that can only be done by means which answer to the idea of education as contrasted with that of excitement. If Mr. Harris had been able to plant here and there throughout the wide circle over which he travelled a competent person, well educated and able to take a respectable position in society, who could maintain and press forward the cause he originated, there is every reason to suppose that the new reformation for which he worked and prayed—hoping against hope—might ere this have dawned upon Scotland. The settled ministries which he did establish drooped and withered mainly through the inability of the congregations to support them according to their obvious requirements. Why could not the means so to do have been put into his hands? There was no lack of ability to supply them if the disposition had prevailed. But such a general effort for such a purpose was never thought of; and thus golden opportunities of usefulness on the widest scale which God seemed to have provided for us as a religious body, were suffered to pass by comparatively unimproved. Let us take heed that, under similar circumstances, this shall not again be the case. What is the worth of any amount of money in comparison with the glory of our successfully maintaining our legitimate position as the leaders of the present tendency of liberal thought on to the only Christian settlement that is possible for it?

The state of circumstances over which we have just glanced makes it necessary that we should look for proofs of the power of Mr. Harris's missionary exertions in the silent influence they have had upon the religious mind of the Scotch population. Nor shall we be disappointed in our search. This influence is palpable to any one who has the means of observing it, and becomes more fully apparent as observation with regard to it extends. What I have said about the effect of his Glasgow ministry, I must in substance repeat about his Scotch ministry in general. The wider field presents the same facts as the smaller one does, with such modifications as its peculiar circumstances occasioned. Throughout the country men are met with who are well known to be personally released from the bondage of the churches to which they belong, and willing to forward measures of theological comprehension, and who owe their free thought entirely in the first instance to their having listened to Mr. Harris's

ministrations. Frequently they are men of some social position —lawyers or even clergymen—who are able with some marked success to diffuse their advanced ideas through the circles in which they move. The young clergy particularly were accustomed to avail themselves of opportunities of hearing Mr. Harris preach, on account of the benefit they expected to derive from his fine elocution. I have been able, in a remote district, to establish a bond of sympathy with a total stranger of this class, solely on the ground of the knowledge acquired by these occasional attendances. Something more than elocution was learned from such attendances. One is sometimes astonished at the just and friendly way in which persons, into casual intercourse with whom one is thrown, will speak of Unitarianism when they find that the privacy of the communication is likely to be safely preserved; and it will commonly appear on inquiry that Mr. Harris's proceedings had something to do with the fair judgment entertained.

Indeed, the manner in which the literature of liberal theology has been excluded from Scotland renders such oral efforts as are associated with his name especially important in conveying a knowledge of that theology. When a young man is obliged to lock up Channing's works in his private desk as he might an unlawful publication, and when a Mechanics' Institution will submit to have all the theological portions of those works cut out in order that the book might be made fit for the library, the Unitarian missionary must be regarded as emphatically a light shining in a dark place. These two allusions are to provable facts; a part of the proof of the second being that a worthy man has in his possession what he considers a curious and valuable volume composed of the exscinded matter, which he was allowed to appropriate as refuse suited only to a depraved taste. The volume ought to be secured for an Unitarian Museum.

Public religious opinion is not now in Scotland what it was at the time of Mr. Harris's inroad upon it. It is both freer and more tolerant. Such proceedings as those by which the Rev. Thomas Wright, the author of *The true Plan of a Living Temple*, was deposed from the ministry of the Church of Scotland on a charge of heresy—unjust and shameful proceedings which still need to be exposed in their full enormity—are now impossible within the pale of that Church. Much more decided and notorious heretics than Mr. Wright was, are numbered among its ministers, and act prominently in the conduct of its affairs without any fear of public accusation. I do not attribute this change in its wide extent to Mr. Harris's operations, or to anything of a similar kind; but where other causes mainly produced it, those operations were in some considerable degree helpful toward the result. In some localities, indeed, these operations may have been the principal element in the change.

vell-informed and intelligent observer gives it to me as his nion, "that it was the courageous spirit displayed by Mr. rris and those who acted with him that chiefly aided in bring-about that tolerant and liberal feeling which now prevails in West of Scotland." The view entertained of his character re at this day is essentially different from what it was. The e gentleman says, "Here, and indeed wherever he preached, has won the esteem of good and reflecting people of all sects. nes innumerable have I heard him spoken of with admiration respect all over the West. They regard him as an erring istian, but as a good man, and one faithful to conscience." o much for his successes. As to his failures, whatever they e, he might have unhesitatingly adopted the pious appeal of prophet of old—"I have laboured in vain, and spent my ngth for nought and in vain; but surely my work is with the d, and my judgment with my God." He himself has elo-ntly spoken in the same strain—"No matter whether we live ot to partake that blessedness; no matter that that sun of y may shine upon our graves; enough for us if our children's dren shall rejoice in its sacred effulgence; enough for us if, onsequence of the seed we are sowing, the golden harvest of th and righteousness wave for our descendants; enough for if, as the effect of our strenuous and united efforts, they, lst enjoying its fruits of purity and loveliness, shall revert h reverential affection to our characters, shall laud our actions hold our memories in hallowed remembrance."*

know not whether I am altogether justified in connecting h this notice of Mr. Harris's missionary labours a reference to frequent journeys to England during the time of his Scotch istry. Some of those journeys partook of that character; , whatever their object was, their distinct mention, as occu-ng a prominent place in this part of his history, could not be tted. He was continually called upon to assist in the occa-al services which were from time to time held among the itarian congregations of the south, and his presence was always comed as that of one who would be sure to increase in a cial way the interest of every meeting he attended. He was stomed to connect his public engagements together, so that journeys involved, day after day, a continued occupation in aching or speaking from the time he left home till his return. May, 1833, he preached the annual sermon before the British Foreign Unitarian Association in South-Place chapel, Fins-y, London, with great effect. It was afterwards published, that in more than one form, under the title of *The Harmony Vature, Providence and Christianity.*

* Christian Pioneer, Vol. III. p. 312.

ADDRESS AT THE OPENING OF THE SESSION OF MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE, OCTOBER 15, 1860.

BY REV. JAMES MARTINEAU.

In entering upon a new term of academic work, our thought and feeling spontaneously look forward, and a fresh spring of hope urges us into a welcome future. A natural light of joy rests upon every open opportunity: clear as yet from the shadow of disappointment or unfaithfulness, it awakens in the young the thirst for an untried experience; in the good, the zeal for unspoiled duty; and even in the ripest age, the irrepressible faith that the errors of the past may be repaired, and every worthy conception pressed nearer to its accomplishment. Yet, while sharing to the full the thankful and elastic spirit of such a time, I cannot pass the threshold of this Anniversary without remembering the various experiences from which we meet upon it here, and which, unless vicissitude is to go without its wisdom, may well give a deeper and more earnest tone to our joint pursuits. To not a few of us the colouring of life has been changed and mellowed otherwise than by the lapse of months; and the studies awaiting us are guarded by gentle images of sorrow or sobered hopes of joy. And while our ranks, which, ere we parted, sickness had so thinned, are now happily filled in and even recruited with unusual force, we have but to look back over the year to see how large a promise for the future is needed, to compensate the public losses of the past. Since our last opening day, many a faithful labourer, whose name was as a household word among us, has laid his burthen and his honours down: the broad popular eloquence of George Harris has handed over its marvels to tradition; the pure simplicity, the assiduous fidelity, the apostolic piety of Benjamin Carpenter are lost to us, except in the healthy fruits with which they covered his field of toil; and, in more direct bereavement of our *Alma Mater*, the voice has been silenced of one of her eldest and dearest sons;—a voice so sweet and tender, so charged with gracious wisdom, so full-toned in its humanity, so trustful in its devotion, that to those who had felt its power, the name of Joseph Hutton must for ever represent the very soul of Pity, Charity and Faith. And if, in reckoning up the buried treasures of the year, we suffer the natural affinities of love and admiration to carry us beyond the rigid lines of country or of system, how can we forget that sad Florentine grave which has quenched the light of so much nobleness? or help feeling that, in the loss of Theodore Parker, the nerve of natural piety, the arm of righteous reform, the courage of every generous hope, are enfeebled not for his world alone but for ours too? In days like ours, when religious faith has lost its hold alike of the base and of the intellectual summit of society, when the life of the hour has grown foreign

to the creeds of ancient centuries, and free access to men's hearts is choked by a barricade of ecclesiastical traditions,—days of temporizing in the Church and of egotism in sects,—when theology wins its mental emancipation by moral casuistry, and Christian zeal borrows its inspiration from party policy, we can ill spare any one of those guileless and unselfish agencies. But let us not repine at the successive transmission of God's trust: let us rather take up the dropped torch of their fidelity, that it may pass from hand to hand, and, fed with a purer oil within each spirit, may shed a brighter light and a more generous warmth from age to age.

The Institution whose work we resume to-day provides for the full Academic training of a permanent succession of Nonconformist Ministers. Its very design, therefore, assumes the perpetual need in Christian society of religious guides and instructors; the natural relation of their work to the whole circle of human knowledge; and the possibility of a Scientific Theology where there is no bespoken conformity. To these principles, and to the high estimate which they imply of the Christian preacher's office, we firmly adhere, in the face of social discouragement and of philosophical disparagement. The accomplished Historian of English Civilization propounds, indeed, a law which, if it were established, would put the mark of impotency and degradation on all such aims and labours as engage us here. The improvement of mankind, he tells us, is due entirely, under similar physical conditions, to *Intellectual* discovery, and is absolutely unaffected by *Moral and Religious* causes: while the arts and sciences are "*cumulative*" and put themselves out to interest from age to age, greatness of character and purity of faith are but the talent in the napkin, incapable of increase. The virtues and the crimes cancel each other. The hero and the saint are balanced by the traitor and the libertine, and leave no residuary product for the world's heritage: the good and evil, after temporary struggle, are alike absorbed, and the permanent half-tide of human nature stands ever at the same level. In spite of the seeming freedom and sublime anticipations of conscience, the actions of mankind are necessitated in their origin and impotent in their results. Nay, it does not satisfy this theory to say that moral and religious truth, from their stationary character, are indifferent to the progress of our race; they exist, it would seem, chiefly in order to be denied; and though inoperative in themselves, they become negatively beneficent when they stimulate the intellect to contradiction, and introduce one of those ages of scepticism which are the highest landmarks of civilization. These paradoxes could not have been more damping to the enthusiasm of the Christian student and disciple, had they been expressly designed for his humiliation. Are they true? Then, in dedicating himself to moral and religious labour, he is

addressing the human weakness instead of evolving the divine strength of our nature, and missing the real hope and glory of the world in ineffectual dreams of a "kingdom of heaven." Are they true? Then, in trusting the inner voices of his humanity as the primary tones of an ethical and spiritual philosophy, to be first revealed from their interpretation and then verified by appeal to a wider consciousness, he is but chasing his own echoes and fancying them the music of the spheres. Are they true? Then, in studying the Religions of the Past, he is studying not the living power, but only the dead sign, of its stage of growth: the sacred literature which records the communings between the human and the Divine mind, and marks the ascending course of faith and aspiration; the poetry which embodies the ideal admirations of mankind; the laws and manners which betray their sense of moral right; the memorials of doctrinal struggle and speculative belief,—the Dialogues of Plato, the Confessions of Augustine, the Thoughts of Pascal; all that most draws the Christian scholar and best assuages his reverential thirst,—must be held of no account and eliminated from the dynamics of history. The only grand result of a true survey of the Past is, that it yields huge averages which swallow up the hopes of individual effort, and drown the whispered appeals to men's hearts, taken one by one.

This doctrine is the newest form of that old Nightmare of Necessity which always returns to sit upon the breast of every age whose spiritual powers are asleep. As often happens with such spectres of the mind, it has an outline shape of truth; but it is empty, and the weight that seems so oppressive is a delusion, which a spring of effort or a start of feeling will suffice to dissipate. There is certainly a sense in which the distinction may be justly drawn between the intellectual part of our nature as progressive, and the rest as constant. There is no assignable limit to the new apprehensions of truth which we may gain; while from new forms of feeling and of will,—new, that is, to our humanity,—we are no doubt precluded. It is always possible to discover an unsuspected law, to bring to light a latent class of facts or relations; but not to invent a novel passion or open a hidden field of obligation. The human reason accordingly, however uniform in its constitution through all time, has a history of its own by which it traces its course from age to age, and so multiplies its aspects as almost to disguise its self-identity: the natural science of one century may be obsolete in another; and Thales, Paracelsus and Faraday, could we bring them together, would be mutually unintelligible. The springs of action and affection, on the other hand, are immortal and unchangeable: the love and hate, the terror, the pity, the sorrow, the crime, that are woven into the epic and drama of a remote antiquity have their fibres still thrilling in the heart of to-day; the same

deeds kindle us to scorn or admiration; the same incidents startle our laughter or our tears; and Homer and Sophocles, Shakspere and Schiller, could they speak together, would find their separate tones flow into a common harmony. It is precisely this persistency in the fundamental bases of our nature that gives to literature its unwithering charm, and that binds in one great kindred the distant ages which the inequalities of science would estrange. So far, then, we can go with Mr. Buckle; we unreservedly allow that, while the movement of our humanity is chiefly traceable in shifting lines of knowledge, its essential uniformity is most strikingly evinced by the inextinguishable force of the same passions, conscience and reverence.

But are we on this account to say, that the intellect which is thus impelled to advance is also the impelling power? that, if it were there alone, its step would be as swift and strong? that the other elements of our nature might abate or increase, sleep or wake, combine or clash as they will, without affecting its competency as the agent of civilization? Far from it. The cognitive capacities of man stir only at the bidding of his affective and voluntary faculties: did his wants never quicken his perception, did his resentments never plunge him into strife, did his pity never press against his resources, did his wonder never set up its fermentation in his thought, his rational existence would remain a mere dormant possibility. The whole dynamics of his life lie in his spontaneous impulses, his regulative morals, his religious sentiments; these it is that work his understanding, dictating its ambition, determining its direction, sustaining its perseverance: and the historian who disregards their condition in order to take account of the arts and sciences alone, is like the meteorologist who should observe only the clouds, and discharge from his reckoning the winds that blow them. Call them, if you please, unprogressive in themselves, they are at least the conditions of all progress,—the constants of our human world that are the base of all its variables,—the conservative elements which give the continuity to times and nations, and out of relation to which the contrasted phenomena of change and revolution cannot be understood. As the political life of a people results from the ever-swaying balance of a principle of order on the one hand and of movement on the other, and can never be interpreted under severance of the two, so the civilization of the world is produced by imperishable affections operating under mutable conditions, and, when described without reference to both, becomes the subject of a mere party history.

The stationary aspect attributed to the moral elements of life is not insisted on in so strict a sense as to exclude the ebb and flow of character. Fluctuations are acknowledged, but are said to cancel one another and be without aggregate effect; and the course of intellectual improvement is supposed to go on inde-

pendently and undisturbed through the neap tide and the flood of good and evil. Surely such assumption overlooks the prime conditions of all mental action. Does it, then, make no difference to the Thought from what source the Thinker's inspiration comes, —whether from the passions of the bad heart, or the love and wonder of the good? or whether he is torn in self-conflict, or brings to his meditations the unbroken force of an harmonious nature? Are there no states of the Will which drain off the whole intellectual force, or turn it into a morbid instrument of delusion? Had moral causes nothing to do with the rise, and nothing with the decay, of the Hellenic and the Roman civilization? Why, then, did the Athens of Pericles sink, with all its accumulated accomplishment, philosophy and art, to the Athens of Herodes Atticus? and the city of the Scipios descend to deify a Domitian and a Caracalla? It was at the awakening call of national danger that these great peoples consolidated their social union, and becoming ennobled by the discipline of sacrifice and rich in the traditions of virtue, earned for themselves the materials, the energy, the security, for intellectual advance. And it was when the springs of the common faith and life were first weakened by dissensions and then broken by overwhelming military power, when private selfishness and licence, under the shadow of public servitude, had assumed the monstrous forms attested by Polybius and denounced by Juvenal, that not only the mental power of the Present became enervated, but the very genius and science of the Past seemed to vivify and bless no more. Were the hoarded capital of thought and knowledge the true measure and force of human progress, the Alexandria of the Ptolemies should rank higher than the young Greece whose affluence she gathered and appropriated: yet with what barren result were the rock-streams of Helikon and Parnes diverted to the sands and swamps of a mere absorbent nature! The whole history of Roman decline is but a protracted proof of the irreversible dependence of social civilization on moral vitality. Paganism, on the one hand, heir of all the culture of the past, entrenched in every stronghold of the earth, commanding boundless material power and the more formidable armoury of opinion and of scorn, dignified by countless traditions of heroism and devotion, and secured alike in the interests of the great, the tastes of the learned, and the passions of the people, was nevertheless unable to hold its own; the concentrated intellect and resource of the world wasted away from it through a mysterious inner dearth; and with its lips of proud and delicate speech, with its eye still brilliant and its brow still clear, it pined with phthisis at the heart, till the ivory sceptre dropped from its hand. And, conversely, Christianity, without a favouring alliance in the present or the past, rude in utterance, provincial in garb, inexpert in thought, passes from city to city, noiselessly lifting the latch of

private life, and after a word or two entertained as an angel that had entered unawares; and soon, through no other power than that of a new trust and the simple surprise of a divine love, it takes up whatever Heathendom was laying down, stops with a breath of purity the decay and desolation of the world, and begins from inward centres that social organism which was to substitute for universal empire an indivisible humanity. The civilization which Intellect could not avail to keep, it was reserved for Faith to win.

There is a marked difference, however, which I am quite willing to admit, between intellectual and moral force in their mode of transmission and their liability to waste and die. Knowledge, by its very nature, grows in *extent;* character in *depth:* and hence the former is certainly "*cumulative*" according to a method not predicable of the latter. Truth, once discovered, may be put on record, together with the evidence revealing it; or may be embodied in some instrument and method of art, whose rationale it supplies; and, in either case, it is thenceforth disengaged from all dependence on its discoverer and becomes the impersonal heritage of mankind. Bradley's paper on the aberration of light, Fourier's researches with regard to heat, placed certain natural laws within human cognizance, though no duplicates of their authors' genius and skill ever should appear. The air-pump incorporates the fact of atmospheric weight, the prism the law of refraction, the stereoscope the conditions of solid vision, though the existence of Otto Guericke and Snell and Wheatstone were unparalleled or forgotten. The positions thus secured by the investigations of one age serve as the point of departure for the industry of the next; Kepler's laws for the celestial physics of Newton, the discoveries of Lavoisier and Davy for the researches of Liebig, the observations of Galileo and Huygens for the instrument of Foucault. By such perpetual conversion of the *quæsita* of a prior period into the *data* of a posterior, death seems to become indifferent to science; and amid the fall of generations the intellect of mankind remains apparently immortal. To this, it must be admitted, there is nothing analogous in the moral and religious history of the world. The Philosopher may bequeath his discoveries; but not the Hero his virtue, or the Saint his sanctity. Character, religious insight, holy faith,—all the spiritual attributes which speak to the conscience and awaken the devout trusts of our nature,—are direct personal emanations and cannot be detached from the individual life of pure and lofty minds. The thoughts they think, indeed, may shape themselves into language, and go down to distant ages as the ethical wisdom or the prophet's vision or the lyric hymn of those who were most near to God; and from such words, written with the inmost spirit's flame, the fire never wholly dies. But no literature is able, like mathematical and physical exposition, to supersede and

replace the living personality of the writer, and so to stand in his stead within the universal human intelligence, that, if only his propositions remain, it would matter not though he had never been. Science is the cold and neutral speech of Nature to the watching mind through the accidental organ of a man; literature, —especially in its voices of affection, conscience and faith,—is the great confessional of humanity, the appeal of the lonely to the universal heart, the cry of deep to deep when the waves ride high and hands are stretched towards the Eternal Rock; it is essentially *personal*, our inner conference with one another, addressing itself to the sympathies, and needing the perpetual verification, of a common nature. Words and signs, which are adequate as the record of material laws and quantitative relations, are but an imperfect vehicle of this subtler action of the free spirit; and when divested of the aid of living light from the eye and tones from the voice and all the mysterious effluence of a kindling and holy presence, give but a cold and faint reflection of the struggling thought within. And, were the expression ever so perfect, it speaks only to a congenial apprehension; to the interpreter without sympathy it has no meaning, but strikes dead upon the ear, like the maxims of experience to the child, or the music of sorrow to the heart stone-deaf. Moral and spiritual truth cannot dispense with reproduction in every mind; it has no efficacy except so far as it takes us up, one by one, and finds for itself a fresh ground and response in each recipient; re-discovered as a real divine presence in the consciousness of individuals, it spreads by numerical multiplication rather than by quantitative enlargement; and as its chief differences are in depth and intensity, it defies the custody of language, and cannot, by mere record, grow from age to age. What, then, is the just inference from this distinction between natural and spiritual truth,—the one being cumulative in magnitude, the other personal in its repetition? Is it that the former alone holds the key of civilization and claims our whole attention; while the latter, in its sameness, may be thrown out of the account? Not at all; for the moral repetition may be, and assuredly is, a not less indispensable condition than the intellectual cumulation: but simply this; that while science has in itself a certain principle of self-preservation, and, once embodied in a treatise or an instrument, may bear desertion for a while and tide over a period of darkness, moral and religious influence cleaves to living persons, spreads by the mutual understanding of affection and reverence, and dies from the heart of a selfish and corrupt age. That which books and arts can do for knowledge must, in higher things, be committed to the ministry of faithful and devoted men; who, daring to yield themselves up as organs of divine truth and love, may awaken in other minds the echoes of righteousness and holy trust, and carry the contagion of faith, hope and charity, within

the reach of each several soul. Suppose all such agencies suspended; let there be none to interpret the handwriting of the Moral Law and the whispers of the Spirit; let the opaque curtains of the actual be drawn close around us for a generation and shut out every unrealized vision and darken the chamber of every seer; and it will soon be evident that, whether moral and religious truth can increase or not, it assuredly can dwindle; as the folds of appetite and interest grow thicker inwards, its sound is stifled; it shrinks to a mere potential point; and has to be recovered *ab initio*, when, through some shock of rescue, its dumb and torpid age is gone. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the spirit is spirit:" low and selfish desires breed their own like in every character around, till society swarms with their deformity, and everything of fairer feature is forgotten and disbelieved; and the living fires of goodness, in like manner,—the heavenly temper, the hidden sacrifice, the repose of simplicity, the energy of utter trust,—spread by proximity from soul to soul, and grow numerous in answering recognition, till multitudes are fused into unity of light and love. If, then, intellect requires for its advance only antecedent knowledge, though it be for ages dead; if conscience and faith, even to hold their own, need the presence and the voice of living goodness and devotion; it is clear that, while the former has resources for ensuring itself, the latter must have its personal propaganda,—its prophets of the open word, its preachers by the silent life,—in every generation.

The distinction already drawn, that our intellectual range has its advance *in extent*, our spiritual apprehension *in depth*, enables us to estimate the frequent taunt, that, at least within the circle of the Christian revelation, morals, metaphysics and theology have disclosed and can disclose no new truths. Suppose it were so; the fact would still not help us forward in our question, whether the disclosure of new truths is the sole force of civilization, or whether the deeper sense of old truths has not its essential influence as well. So far as these provinces become fruitful of discovery, they would themselves lie within the intellectual domain, and could only swell the triumph of its proud power. The real state of the case perhaps is this: human wonder directs itself into two fields, related in reality, divided in our apprehension; viz. (1) the play and flow of phenomena, by which, in this universe, the scenes are ever shifting before the observing eye, and through which the detecting intellect reads and registers a stated order of change; and (2) the eternal ground, the uncreated conditions, the self-existing Cause, whence, as unchanging, the successions of change all come. In the former field, we note what *evanescently happens;* in the latter, what *ever is*. Both of them make themselves a home within us through appropriate faculties of our nature; the one opening communication with

our perceptive and generalizing powers; the other with the pure Reason and Conscience. As the objects of the first are the endless transients, of the second the simple eternities, of the world, it is evident that, in proportion as they both see truly, the cognition of the one must move on and reckon anew; while that of the other must stand and only more deeply gaze; and did this test fail or shift, of *discovery* in Science, of *constancy* in Morals and Religion, the essence of the two would be confounded, and the pretensions of both upset. Is this distinction, then, consonant as it is with the nature of the objects known, any disparagement of the steady term? Can it be less important to the integrity and force of faculty whence all civilizing impulse must come, that we should present the open and sensitive eye to the patient infinitudes, than that we should keep accurate account of the laws of passing change? If our foresight of the facts of life depends on the right reading of its laws of natural succession, our insight into its spirit depends on the interpretation of its abiding and divine realities; and though we cannot say that, by truly construing the unchangeable Moral Law reflected in our nature and that eternal Mind where it is self-luminous, we ever gain new material arts or wider phenomenal vision, who can doubt that our whole tone of sentiment and affection may be thus transformed, and our entire personality be harmonized with the conditions amid which we live? Strange indeed would it be, if in a world wherein God dwells, revealing Himself in the constitution of its agents and on the field of its history, it could be neutral to its civilization whether this master-key to its whole meaning were reverently applied or absolutely missed!

In truth, the animating spring of all improvement, in individuals and in societies, is not their knowledge of the actual, but their conception of the possible. To the personal conscience there is ever present a higher than it has reached, a light beyond that throws a perpetual shadow on the track behind. And if the social reformer who takes his vow against some public sin, successfully defies the cold cautions of experience, it is because the vision of a purified future steadies his eye and nerves his arm. And when a nation, after being parcelled out and crushed for generations beneath cruel and stupid tyrannies, rises in an hour, shakes off not its fetters only, but its jealousies, vindictiveness and lassitude, and proclaims its genius to be one, generous and free,—this is no mere revulsion from a degraded past: it is that some noble leader's dream of hope has fixed before the people's mind an image glorious in its simplicity, which is their guiding star through the wilds and dangers they must pass. But for this irrepressible idea, sleeping or waking at the heart of our humanity, we should have no standard by which to try the present and measure its deformities and sins; and, until it emerges from an *idea into a faith*, till it stands with us not for a prismatic sem-

blance, but for the only real,—not for a dream of our own, but for a thought of God,—it can only breathe a sadness into life, and touch it with the flush of a hectic beauty: it may shape itself into creations of Art; it may speak in tones of Poetry; but it will lay no powerful hold upon the springs of the Will, inspire no sacrifice, dare no conflict. This is the very function of Morals and Religion,—this conversion of ideal thoughts into spiritual realities and solemn duties; and wherever there speaks to us a true interpreter, able to withdraw the veil of our inmost conscience, it is always to discover a divine substance under the form of some human dream, to detect an everlasting authority in some flitting surmise, to snatch us from the idle pathos of our poetic soliloquies, and set us abashed before them as tones from the living Word of God. So completely is our nature constituted to answer such appeal, that, till it reaches us, a sense of falsehood cleaves to everything, and we have no content; and few are burdened with spirits more uncertain, tempers more corrosive, convictions more precarious, than those who attempt to live only within the walls and by the rules of visible experience. Try to teach mankind by the mere maxims and expositions of external prudence and rectitude; offer them the whole code of wisdom deduced from the "natural laws;" abate every ideal claim, and ask them for nothing beyond their immediate powers; shew them that you have brought everything down to their own terms, and made it rational, easy and rewarding; and do you think you have found your way to either their better reason or their hearts? On the contrary, they will turn from you flattened and dispirited, thinking meanly of a life whose possibilities are so soon exhausted and of a nature from which you dare demand no more; they cannot bear this weary level; they feel the stirring of some restless wing that would shew them a deeper depth, a higher height; they know themselves made to sin upon a greater scale, and to be snatched into a sublimer redemption, than your unimpeachable rules and warnings contemplate. Humanity, left to itself, grows sick of its own company, and gasps for the relief of a holier air; and duty, however clearly seen and owned, remains languid and half done, except by the spirit that can rise beyond it. Not till the conscience has caught the vision of a divine perfection do the small human graces shine with any light. To this ideal constitution of our nature the Christian revelation, need I say, perfectly corresponds. What does its chief message set before us but a "kingdom of heaven," where the inner meaning of this world shall at length be realized, and man shall no longer disappoint the thought of God in creating him? And is not this hope presented to us by One in whose own person it was realized,—the spiritual head of our humanity, whose immortal life shines down upon us till it has drawn all men to its likeness? The whole appeal of Chris-

tianity is to secret and ideal relations that transcend the sphere of inductive experience; to the unbreathed thoughts that lurk behind the act, the tender purities that shrink from speech aloud; to the faith which "endures as seeing him who is invisible;" to the charity which keeps "from the left hand what the right hand doeth;" to the hope "that is not seen;" to the "mystery that doth not yet appear;" to the spirit "which searcheth deep things," and whose "witness" "cannot be uttered;" to the "life which is hid with Christ in God." The power, the sanctity, the solace of the gospel, all flow from this image of divine things behind the earthly and the human;—an image which no statistics of physical law can supersede or blot out, but whose colours,—unless what is highest in our nature and the past deceives us,—will continue to gleam through the dust of this world's course, and light up the darkness of its end.

Though, however, moral and religious teaching can never be a copy of the actual world, but always of a divine ideal that transcends it, yet, in order to apply it to the relations and consciousness of men, it must keep clear of all variance with their widening knowledge and highest feeling: it must be pliant to the expanding pressure of new and nobler thought; and take care never to be the material contradiction, but always the holy transfiguration, of the universe, of history, of life, as the freshest and largest intelligence represents them. This necessity it is that renders it impossible to dispense with the fullest mental culture in those who aspire to a share in the Christian guidance of their time, and demands of them that they keep well abreast of the science, the scholarship, the philosophy, of their age. The "kingdom of heaven" is not the same in its picture, though continuous in its spirit, through the centuries as they succeed: once it was the little Hebrew realm; to the Baptist it was Messiah's coming; to the Apostles the return of Christ and the end of the historic æons; to the Chiliasts the Millennium; to the medieval Catholicism the Roman theocracy; to the Evangelical Protestants the invisible Church of the elect; to a few the life to come; to *all*, according to the measure of their conception, the Divine thought and life in the world. It has transmigrated from form to form as each became too small to hold it, or was dissolved by the touch of time; and now, amid the riches of our modern experience, beneath the canopy of Herschel's sky, upon the surface of a Lyell's earth, at the end of Bunsen's ages of humanity, and in presence of a Müller's conspectus of tongues and peoples, it can never resume its antiquated shapes; nor dare we finally fix it with a Lo! here, or Lo! there; but can only wait upon the seasons of an expanding Providence, knowing that through all the "kingdom of God is within us." From the mere fact that *Theology* is not so much one of the special segments of know*ledge*, as the comprehension of them all under the light and

within the embrace of spiritual faith, it comes into contact with all the lines of human research: it belies its very nature when it rests content with the *cram* of professional learning, or only fills the torrent of a narrow zeal; and in its discipline it needs no less a genuine intellectual catholicity than, in its application, an unhesitating breadth and warmth of love. Whilst the simple devotedness of a pure and pious mind is a power unspeakably higher than any mere mental gift, it cannot in our time put itself forth with its proper efficacy, except under condition of competent sympathy with the modes and images of thought that distinguish the present from the past. In different strata of society the exigencies of ministration are doubtless in some degree different; though I believe there are none where the apprehensive tact and ready resource and refined bearing of the scholar and the gentleman will not be felt as powerful aids to the charity and devotion of the Christian. But whatever scope there may be, in the great Infirmary of human ills, for faithful labour in every form, *some* at least there ought ever to be who, while not slow to bind the wounded and tend the cup of cold water, can look beyond the suffering symptoms of the hour, or even the epidemic of the day, and following the maladies of our humanity to their deepest ground can obey the Supreme Physician's voice, "Bring them hither to me."

But from the theoretical defence of our objects in this Institution I must turn to notice in conclusion the present aspect of its practical operation. Of the four Students who completed their term at the close of the last Session, all are at work in congenial spheres of ministerial duty except one who, having the advantage of a Hibbert scholarship, prolongs his studies for a further period. Six new Students for the ministry, all of whom have satisfactorily passed their entrance examination, take their place in the first year; one of whom, admitted by special arrangement, comes to us from the Transylvanian brethren; the first link in a chain, not we trust soon to be broken, of sympathy and intercourse with a foreign church, which has a history longer than our own, and which, distant as it is, has been brought near to us at the costly sacrifice of an honoured and faithful life. This eighth Session since our removal from the North thus opens with eighteen Divinity Students,—a number which, so far as we remember, has never been exceeded in the present generation. A new, and to all its teachers a most welcome, feature has been given to the present Session, by the regular entrance into the College of two Students who are intended for civil life, but whose qualifications for the duties of accomplished citizens are not, it is wisely thought, likely to be unfavourably affected by some tincture of sacred learning and thoughtful apprehension of religious principle. In the report of the classes of University College, the names of some of our Students occur with honour-

able mention: in the Senior Greek, Mr. Dowson obtained the first prize. In the Junior Latin, Mr. Odgers received the first prize and certificate, and in Junior Greek the fourth certificate. And Mr. Pilcher obtained the prize in the Lower Junior Mathematics; the fourth certificate in the Junior Latin; and the sixth certificate in the Junior Greek. May younger Students emulate these honourable examples, not indeed in the mere ambition for distinction, but from the conscientious resolve to do soundly whatever is done at all, and from that love of clear and accurate learning which is one of the marks of a faithful and earnest mind!

It is perhaps stepping beyond my province to notice events that belong to the internal history of other Institutions than our own. Yet so nearly associated are the functions of our College with those both of this Hall, where our Theological Students receive their instruction, and of University College, where our Juniors have their chief classes, that no new incident which draws any of them closer can be indifferent to us; and I should be suppressing a feeling as natural as it is sincere, did I not express the respectful congratulations of my colleagues and myself on the appointment to the Chair of History in University College of the accomplished Principal of University Hall. May this enlargement in the sphere of action which opens around these walls make them more and more the centre and the home of noble aspirations, of enlightened principle, and of generous and manly ties!

PAULINE HISTORY OF CEPHAS.

SIR,

ENCOURAGED by your insertion in the Christian Reformer for July (p. 479) of my attempt to vindicate the apostle Peter, and to clear him from any difference whatever with the apostle Paul, I shall proceed with my "Pauline History of Cephas," in order to establish, on the authority of certain old MSS. (referred to in my former paper), that this Cephas (not Peter) was the person whom Paul rebuked at Antioch in Syria for anti-christian views of Messiah's revelation. But it may be expected that I shall, in the first place, attempt to shew who this Cephas was. That he boasted of being by descent "a Hebrew, an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, and a minister of Messiah," I think may be inferred from 2 Cor. xi. 21, 22. That he had been a disciple and follower of Jesus during his lifetime, and a witness of his resurrection, may be taken for granted from 1 Cor. xv. 4, 5 (comp. Luke xxiv. 18). That Cephas was an early member of the Jewish Christian church raised up at Jerusalem by the preaching of the apostles after the day of Pentecost, but chiefly by Peter and John (see Acts i., ii., iii.), we may, I think, be assured from the way in which Paul speaks of Cephas in certain passages of Galatians, quoted in my last paper. At this early date, these Jewish Christians were by the unbelieving Jews considered only as a sect of the Jews, and were denominated by their fellow-countrymen "Nazarenes" (Acts xxiv. 5, 14); consisting, however, of two classes of Jews (Acts vi. 1, and John xii. 20),—first, the Hebrews, of the pure Jewish stock, and to this class apparently both Paul (2 Cor. xi. 22) and

Cephas belonged; and second, the Hellenists, or Grecians, who had become proselytes to the Jewish Law, like Nicolas (Acts vi. 5), and consequently had been circumcised previously to their conversion to Christianity. The first church of Jewish Christians which was established out of Judea was that at Antioch, A.D. 41. It was composed of those Nazarenes who fled from Jerusalem on the death of Stephen (Acts ix. 19), A.D. 36 and 37. Additions were made from the Hellenists of Syria, that is, Jewish proselytes; so that party (Jewish Christians) prevailed at Antioch, where Latin and Greek were spoken. Probably, therefore, *they* changed the name of the sect to "Christiani" (Acts xi. 26); for no other cause can be assigned * for translating the name into Latin,—the two names, Nazarene and Christian, being for a long time after considered even by the Jews as synonymous; for when Agrippa said unto Paul (Acts xxvi. 28), "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian," Paul understood Agrippa to say that he was almost persuaded to be what Paul was; and Paul, when he was accused before Felix by Tertullus of being a "Nazarene" (Acts xxiv. 5), did not deny, but confessed, that he belonged to that sect or "schism." So also when Peter, in his First Epistle (iv. 16), says, "If any man suffer for being a Christian," he, writing to Jewish Christians, cannot be supposed to mean any other Christian. But to return. There were other converts soon added (A.D. 42, 43) to the church of Antioch, not of Hellenists (proselytes), but of Greeks (heathen converts), who had never been circumcised and refused to be circumcised. This caused a difference between the circumcised and the uncircumcised Christians. About this time, A.D. 40, Paul was at Tarsus, having been driven from Jerusalem because the "Grecians" (Acts ix. 29), or Greek proselytes, with whom he had "disputed," sought to kill him; and about the same time, while at Tarsus (Acts ix. 30), it probably was that Paul, "three years after his conversion (Gal. i. 18), went up thence to Jerusalem to see Cephas, and abode with him fifteen days," but without seeing any apostle or any person other than James, the Lord's brother. The coincidence of time and circumstances almost justify us in supposing that Cephas had already taken side with the circumcision against Paul, who from his conversion had taken up the cause of the heathen converts, or the uncir-

* Lardner and others think that the name "Christiani," being Latin, it was first used by the Roman governors and judges in the provinces of Syria and Asia Minor, to distinguish that class of Jews who were followers of their prophet Jesus, and was understood by the Romans to comprehend all heathen Christians, whether circumcised and whether Jews or not; that is, they did not inquire whether the Christians were Jewish proselytes or not. But it is not improbable that when the dispute at Antioch as to circumcision was at its height, the Nazarene party rejected the Roman name, while the party of the uncircumcised heathen converts took it up, to distinguish themselves from the circumcision, and from Cephas, their schismatic leader. But schism implies a separation from communion—and such separation, two meeting-houses; and in the speeches and apostolic letter at the council of Jerusalem, we find support given to this view of the position of the Christians at Antioch. James says (Acts xv. 19), "Wherefore my sentence is, that we trouble not those who, from among the Gentiles, are turned unto God:" "For Moses hath of old times in every city them that preach (the Law) of Moses, the same being read in the synagogues every sabbath-day," viz. both to Jews and Christian Jews. Again, the letter (Acts xv. 23) is addressed, not to Nazarenes, but specifically "unto the brethren who are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia." Again (ver. 24), "Forasmuch as we have heard that certain who came out from us have troubled you,.... but to whom we gave no such commandment, it seemed good unto us to send chosen men" (as opposed to these unaccredited persons) "with our beloved Barnabas and Paul, men who have hazarded their lives for the name of the Lord Jesus." Here we have accredited testimony to the views of Barnabas and Paul set against the unaccredited views of Cephas and his party. See Gal. ii. 11, to the end, beginning with, "But when Cephas was come to Antioch," as given in full in my last.

cumcision; but hopeless of a compromise with Cephas from this visit, Paul had returned to Tarsus, whence he was soon after brought to Antioch by Barnabas (Acts xi. 25). It is clear that, after this, Cephas became more bigoted to his own views; and thus there is reason for conjecture that his views were, even now, such as he probably entertained during the lifetime of Jesus, such as some of the apostles themselves entertained at that time, viz. that the Messiah was "to restore the kingdom to Israel,"—views of a temporal reign of Messiah which even the first appearance to Cephas (see 1 Cor. xv. 4, 5; Luke xxiv. 18) of the risen Jesus could not dispel, even though assured of his error by those (of whom he may have been one) who witnessed the ascension (Acts i. 6, 7). Such being the views of Cephas, it is evident they were dangerous to the spread of Christianity; not only because they were promotive of rebellion against Rome, but because they were prejudicial also to the true interests of Christians, fixing their prospects to this world regardless of the next, and ultimately, as we shall find to be the case with Cephas and his party, destroying the benefits of the resurrection of Jesus, by leaving no hopes in the mind of a future state different from or higher than those which the Jews already possessed. We cannot wonder, then, that Paul's more enlightened views of the reign of Messiah should from this date have placed him in direct opposition to Cephas. Cephas, on the other hand, seems from this date also to have decided to become a missionary, treading in the footsteps of Paul, with the view of frustrating Paul's efforts for the propagation of Christianity in heathen countries.

Accordingly we find from Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, written at Corinth A.D. 52 (as stated in my last paper), that during Paul's first missionary tour with Barnabas from Antioch (Acts xiii. 2—14, 26—28), involving a period of three years, A.D. 45—48, Cephas, accompanied (as will be seen afterwards) by Cerinthus, another Nazarene of the church of Jerusalem, must here be assumed to have belonged to those "certain persons (Acts xv. 1) who came down from Judea (A.D. 49) and taught the brethren," the Greek converts at Antioch, "that unless circumcised they could not be saved." We must here assume further, that on his return to Antioch with Barnabas, Paul found there "these false brethren (Gal. ii. 4), who had been unawares brought in with the design of privately spying out the liberty" of these brethren at Antioch, that is, their exemption from circumcision. The conference at Jerusalem which resulted, A.D. 49 or 50, and Paul's rebuke of Cephas, have been given in my last letter. But it is worthy of special observation that the circular letter of James and the apostles confirming Paul's views of the exemption of heathen converts from circumcision, is introduced by these words (Acts xv. 24): "Forasmuch as we have heard that certain who went out from us have troubled you with words subverting your souls, saying, Ye must be circumcised and keep the Law, to whom we gave no such commandment," &c. It is true that Paul, in his account of this conference given to the Galatians, says, "that when James (the Lord's brother), Cephas and John (Mark), who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, that we should go to the heathen and they unto the circumcision." This implies a compromise between Paul and Cephas, the true meaning of which must be thus understood:—both of them might become missionaries if they chose, both might visit heathen countries; but Paul was to preach exemption from circumcision to those converts he should make among "uncircumcised" heathen, while Cephas was to restrict his preaching to circumcised heathen only, that is, Jewish proselytes, there being no restraint put upon either so far as regards preaching the gospel to the Jews. But Cephas must have acted on this occasion with duplicity, not only towards Paul, but towards James and the church of Jerusalem; for from the whole tenor of the Epistle to the Galatians, we cannot doubt that Cephas, leaving Jerusalem (cir. A.D. 52), but without again visiting Antioch, proceeded direct to Galatia and preached the gospel there; but not Paul's gospel. For he says to the

Galatians (i. 6), "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him—that is, myself—who called you into the grace of Messiah (cir. A.D. 50) unto another gospel; which indeed is not another message of good tidings: on the contrary, that some now with you would trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Messiah." Again (ver. 9), "If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received" from me, "let him be anathematized;" for I assure you (ver. 11) "that the gospel which was preached unto you by me is not after man." These verses, taken in connection with the rebuke which Paul tells the Galatians he gave to Cephas at Antioch, make it clear that Cephas was he whom Paul points out as "troubling" the Galatians in the same way as he had "troubled" the church of Antioch.

If we now take up Paul's two Epistles to the Thessalonians, written at Corinth cir. A.D. 52, we shall find satisfactory proof that Cephas, leaving Galatia, must have followed Paul into Macedonia, A.D. 51, "troubling" the churches there, and exciting against Paul the bitter enmity of the Jewish population. Even in Luke's history (Acts xvii. 5, cir. A.D. 51) we find traces of Cephas and his party: "The Jews who believed not, moved with envy, took unto them certain lewd fellows of the baser sort, and gathered a mob, and set all the city in an uproar," &c. Beza translates these lewd fellows into "circumferendis viris sceleratis—*Anglicè*, "wicked vagabonds" (comp. Acts xix. 13). This mixed mob, Paul insinuates, in his First Epistle (ii. 15, 16), as will be seen by and by, to have been led on by Cephas. In fact, Cephas, having now joined Cerinthus, had, like the latter, become a heretic (see Lardner's History of Heretics) as well as a schismatic.

That this Jewish mob had terrified such Jewish converts as Paul had made at Thessalonica (see Acts xvii. 3, 4) and forced them to join Cephas, seems probable from this,—that both of Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians are addressed to heathen converts solely, whose conversion "had been so spread abroad (1 Thess. i. 8) through Macedonia and Achaia" (from the capital of which, Corinth, Paul was writing), "that he had no need to speak it; for they themselves"—people in every place where he had been—tell us (tell me) "what wonders my coming among you had effected, and how ye turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God; and to look forward to the spread of the gospel of his Son from heaven, whom He raised from the dead, Jesus, who will deliver us from the impending punishment" (meaning of the Jews, as will immediately be made apparent). "For ye, brethren (ii. 1), yourselves know that my coming among you was not in vain; for my exhortation was not of erroneous doctrine, nor of impure conduct, nor was it delivered by me with guile; but as I was permitted of God to be put in trust with the gospel, I spoke to you as one so entrusted; not as one seeking to please men, but as one seeking to please God, who trieth the hearts of all. For the same reason, never at any time did I use flattering words, as ye know, nor assume the cloak of covetousness; God is my witness." In these passages we cannot fail to discover a contrast between Paul and some opponent (see Belsham, in loco, Vol. IV. p. 27, note), and its application to Cephas seems obvious. Farther proof that Paul is writing to heathen converts from idolatry may be gathered from what follows. He calls upon them (ii. 12) "to walk worthy of God, who has called them unto his glorious reign" upon earth (viz. that which they were expecting or looking forward to); thanking God that "they received the word or message of God which they heard from him (Paul) not as the word of men" (not as having temporal views, as Cephas taught), but as it is in truth, the word of God." Paul next exhorts these converts from idolatry to bear their sufferings in patience, "after the example of the churches of God in Judea which are in Christ;" adding (ii. 14), "For ye also are suffering like things of your own countrymen, even as they of the Jews, who both killed the Lord Jesus and their own teachers, and have persecuted me (ver. 15, 16); for they please not God, and are opposers of all his teachers, forbidding me to speak to the heathen" (in which Cephas joins them) "that they may be saved. Thus

they are continually filling up their sins; but their punishment is coming upon them, even to their extermination."

In concluding the Second Epistle (2 Thess. iii. 1), written at Corinth like the First, and in the same year, A.D. 52, we find these very remarkable words: "Finally, my brethren, pray for me, that the word of the Lord may have free course and be glorified" (viz. here at Corinth) "even as with you, and that I may be delivered from unreasonable and wicked men." Query: Were the "certain lewd fellows of the baser sort," formerly spoken of as being at Thessalonica ("these wicked vagabonds")—were they now at Corinth? This leads us to an examination of the two Epistles to the Corinthians, which throw great light on the farther history of Cephas. But it would extend this paper too much to enter upon this examination now.

August 8, 1860. PETER.

CORRESPONDENCE.

REV. WILLIAM HINCKS AND MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE.

SIR,

IN my former letter I was careful to express some doubt whether my resignation of my situation at York hastened in any degree the crisis in the affairs of the College which led to its removal. I must accept Mr. Wood's testimony that it did so. I am without documents, as it is known to my friends that I lost all my papers of every kind, with much valuable property, by shipwreck. I have now no recollection whatever, although all the occurrences of that period made a deep impression on my mind, and I seem to myself to retain them clearly, of my having had any reason to believe that I hastened Mr. Wellbeloved's resignation. If anxiety respecting my own prospects erased from my mind a circumstance in which I should naturally have felt so much interest, I greatly wonder at it; but my belief is that I never was made acquainted with the fact. However this may be, I am confident that Mr. Wellbeloved's approaching retirement was known to me; that its consequence, a removal of the institution, was anticipated as certain; and that having what appeared to me sufficient grounds, perhaps in knowledge of the opinion of peculiarly influential individuals, for judging what was likely to be done in what immediately affected myself,—whereas before, though dissatisfied with pecuniary results, I had hope of improvement, which with my interest in my employment, my sense of the importance of the office I held, and my dread of change and the new anxieties it must bring, counterbalanced the dissatisfaction,—now I had no longer anything to expect from the future, and, feeling that I must soon be unsettled, I thought it wrong to delay the necessary effort to form a new plan of life.

My friend Mr. Wood seems inclined to maintain, on the authority of the documents to which he has access, that I have entirely lost sight of my own reasons for resigning my office. This is absolutely impossible. I could not with propriety assign in an official letter the reasons I have referred to; and the other cause of discontent was one which might have led me to leave, as he has sufficiently shewn, at any time for years

previously, and seemed quite sufficient in itself. There is then no real inconsistency between Mr. Wood's statement and mine, excepting that I did not believe myself to have even hastened a little the retirement of Mr. Wellbeloved, towards whom I had the strongest feelings of respect and attachment as a tutor, a colleague and a friend.—I think Mr. Wood might as well have left undisturbed at this time and in the present connection the discussions between me and the College Committee on pecuniary affairs. These things have long passed away and ceased to interest. Of course I undertook my office expecting to live by it. The emoluments of the resident tutor depended much on the number of students, especially of lay students. That number had diminished before I went. I was induced to hope that it would again increase. It never did so to any considerable extent or with any permanence. We can all now see that it was not likely to do so, and that only the solid reputation of the institution and the exertions of some of its friends enabled it to secure any beyond the foundation students. For my part, I have long entirely approved of and rejoiced in the change of views as to the higher education in the great body of the laity among the Non-subscribing Presbyterians, consequent on changes going on outside their body, which prevented the desired increase. But of this change I happened to be the victim, having to bring up a family and support an expensive establishment with insufficient means. The Committee were not illiberal: they manifested kindness and a desire if possible to make the arrangements more satisfactory. But they looked at the affair from a different point of view, and had other considerations which they were bound to take into account. Hence discussions from time to time arose, and in the end I left my situation with an absolute pecuniary loss which I could ill bear. I suppose the evil was unavoidable. I have long since ceased to complain of it, laying the blame, if there was any, to my own want of foresight respecting the changes of the times, and of steadiness in resisting, when well and happily situated, the application made to me, which certainly did me great honour, to undertake an office which I should never have sought, and was on many accounts indisposed to accept.

Toronto, Sept. 26, 1860. WILLIAM HINCKS.

ON NATURAL DEPRAVITY.

SIR,

ALLOW me a few more words on the subject of Natural Depravity. I think that I understand Mr. Hinton's arguments, but still cannot say that I am convinced. I will allow that God must create finite and fallible beings, *liable* to err; but it is not very evident that on this account they *must* err. If there were a logical necessity that a being liable to err should always be a sinful being, how then could the Unitarian idea of Christ have been arrived at? But Mr. Hinton does not altogether ascribe the sinful state of man to necessity; he says that liability to err conjoined to the principle of self-love "*naturally* degenerates into selfishness, which is the germ of sin" (or I think he could

not object to say, "which is sin"); which I suppose means that it degenerates because of a law of nature—that is, because of a law of God; which is as much as to say that God has made it so that man must degenerate into sin. This is an evident stumbling-block; and to say that it could not be otherwise, is simply to say that the laws of nature could not have been fashioned otherwise.

He says further, that evil is made subservient to the production of good, "just as medicine in the hand of a skilful physician," and "is a necessary part of the Divine government." But this seems to me to leave the difficulty just where it was; because if good can only be wrought through the agency of evil, such a state of affairs is of itself an evil; it would be much better if good could be wrought in another way. That the physician has to use medicine to effect his cures is in itself a disadvantage; it would be better if he cured without medicine, and he would gladly do so if he could. It is his want of power that obliges him to resort to unpleasant means of cure. To say that "evil is a necessary part of the Divine government," is therefore to say that God is obliged to make use of means which in themselves are objectionable to Him.

Mr. Hinton further says, that "evil is founded in wisdom and goodness as well as in necessity," and that the religious mind sees this,—which looks very much like an endeavour to reconcile the existence of evil with that of God by making an apology for sin itself. I think I have occasionally heard something of the same sort from our own pulpits, and am therefore for the sake of our faith the more anxious to raise my protest against it. Of all modes of solving the difficulty, this one appears to me to be the most false and dangerous; for I cannot but think it must tend to make us look upon sin with more of complacency, and I believe it to be contradicted by the direct word of God in our own souls. To say that the experiences of religion teach us this, seems to me to say what is directly the contrary to the truth. One of our most revered divines, in treating of the same subject, has said as follows: "For myself, I can never sit at the feet of Jesus and yield up a reverential heart to his great lessons, without casting myself upon the persuasion that God and evil are everlasting foes; that never and for no end did He create it; that His will is utterly against it, and never touches it but with annihilating force."

But, Sir, in making these objections I must confess that I have no counter theory to bring forward myself. The fact is, that try the argument which way you will, it always appears to me that you arrive at conclusions that are inadmissible. The end that we must come to is this, that the Unitarian as well as the Trinitarian must acknowledge boldly that there are mysteries incomprehensible in the ways of the Most High. But if He has seen fit to veil from us the answers to the questions, "Whence is evil?" and "Why is it?" all that really concerns our spiritual growth He has made plain enough. I think that He has told us clearly that, from whencesoever it may be, it is not of Him, but that it is His enemy, which He fights against; that He is always waiting near us, ready, if when we see the foe approach we throw ourselves on His protection, to contend against it for us and bear us off the victors; and He has told us over and over again through the experiences of life, that through Him alone can we hope to conquer.

Will it be urged, that if we look upon evil as the enemy of God, and can offer no solution to the question of why He allows it to exist, we run into danger of losing our faith in the existence of God? I answer, that there is no such danger to the truly religious mind; that, on the contrary, it is easier to put faith in Him when we look upon evil as His irreconcilable enemy, than when we treat it as in any degree His friend. The one may be the conclusion of our own arguments, but the other is the substance of the word of God.

I have no intention, Sir, of addressing you again on this subject. The suggestions that I have thrown out in rather a random manner must be taken merely as suggestions to be worked out by your readers, many of whom are doubtless much better able to treat the subject than your humble servant, FIDES.

ORIGEN'S HETERODOXY.

SIR,

I WAS much surprised at reading the following passage in the review of the Essays and Reviews in the last No. of the Christian Reformer, p. 599: "We remark that Origen, the father of the science of biblical interpretation, was a Unitarian, expressly forbidding prayer to Christ." In the account given by Lardner of Jerome is contained a summary of the charges against Origen. Lardner adds this remark: "It is not allowed by all that Origen himself was heterodox in the doctrine of the Trinity." It may, I presume, be inferred from this passage that the learned and most industrious author could not have been acquainted with anything in Origen which forbids prayer to Christ, which would be an undeniable proof of the heterodoxy of Origen on the subject of the Trinity. I beg, therefore, to request the reviewer, through your pages, to point out the portion of the writings of Origen on which his assertion is founded. L.

THE ADVANCED GUARD OF THE HUMAN RACE.

SOCIETY, indeed, has its great men and its little men, as the earth has its mountains and its valleys. But the inequalities of intellect, like the inequalities of the surface of our globe, bear so small a proportion to the mass, that in calculating its great revolutions, they may safely be neglected. The sun illuminates the hills while it is still below the horizon; and truth is discovered by the highest minds a little before it becomes manifest to the multitude. This is the extent of their superiority. They are the first to catch and reflect a light, which without their assistance must in a short time be visible to those who lie far beneath them.—*Lord Macaulay.*

CRITICAL NOTICES.

UNITARIAN SERMONS.

Jesus the Christ, the True Foundation: a Sermon on the Unitarian Basis of Church Communion. By G. Vance Smith, B.A., Ph.D., Minister of St. Saviourgate Chapel, York. 12mo. Pp. 18. London—Whitfield.

The Christian Life. Two Sermons preached in Essex-Street Chapel, Strand. By J. Panton Ham. 8vo. Pp. 24. London—Whitfield.

A VOICE potent for good or evil has of late dogmatically asserted that the Unitarians are a nearly extinct sect. Such publications as those the titles of which we have given above shew that if our ministers and congregations are dying out, they can nevertheless speak and act as if in full possession of "the Christian life." So long as our ministers can preach vigorous sermons like those of Mr. Smith and Mr. Ham, full of manly religious thought and scriptural argument, and conceived and expressed in the true Christian spirit, and our congregations listen to such discourses with pleasure and request their publication, and when published give them a wide circulation,—the best possible refutation will be given to those who, in simple ignorance or crafty ill-will, tell the world that Unitarians are an extinct or a moribund body.

Circumstances in the city of York, probably not unknown to our readers, have given peculiar timeliness and interest to Mr. Vance Smith's exposition of Church Communion on the Unitarian Basis. A worthy clergyman, holding preferment in York Minster, lately remarked, in an attempt (more courageous than prudent) to magnify the significance of a recent conversion, that "varied phases of faith" prevail amongst us. We admit and glory in the fact, when reduced to its rightful dimensions, and when its causes and consequences are correctly explained. It is the result of that private judgment which is the right of every church and every man. But even in their wider results our "varied phases of faith" do not interfere with our religious life or our church communion. They afford no ground for the popular misconceptions which widely prevail respecting us. Mr. Smith thus describes those prejudices:

> "We are, with many, a self-willed denomination, who do not hearken as we ought to the Word of God, but prefer to follow the dictates of our own blind understandings; we are bound together by no definite bond of sound doctrine, but have only vague, uncertain or negative principles; the liberty of thought and speech, which we so much value, is inconsistent with any firm adherence to Christian Truth; because we do not bind one another to the public confession of a formal creed, therefore, as a body of worshipers, we have no common ground of faith that is clear, definite and scriptural,—but are exposed, and accustomed, to be tossed about by every wind of strange doctrine."—Pp. 4, 5.

In correction of these misconceptions, Mr. Smith undertakes to "shew that we do stand, as a religious community, upon a broad and sure foundation; that, while not attempting to limit and control one another by any *Creed*, and while endeavouring to allow and to use the utmost liberty of thought and speech, we do yet most fully admit a principle of union which is distinctly and essentially both Scriptural and Christian." He makes good his ground by shewing that this is so not merely

because we are united as a body of religious persons, worshipers of Almighty God, but because we take CHRIST as our Teacher, recognize his authority and copy his example.

In answering the question, why Unitarians do not join some of the established communities around them, and why they think it necessary to stand apart and form their own, Mr. Smith is led directly into the very heart of the Trinitarian controversy. He shews the subordination of Christ to God, and that the existence and authority of the Son are entirely derived from the Father. He next proceeds to shew that in the doctrine of Jesus, the Christ, the Son of God, Unitarians possess a great and fundamental truth on which to build their church.

After an excellent description of the working and spirit of a Christian church based on the doctrine of Jesus, the Christ, the Son of God, Mr. Smith thus happily proceeds not only to defend the Unitarian liberty, but to carry the war into the orthodox camp, by shewing the strange inconsistencies into which they are led, spite of their professed adherence to an uniform faith:

"In all this, again, I repeat, there is nothing that ought to be stigmatized as vague, uncertain, or merely negative in its character. LIBERTY, indeed, is there for every earnest mind to read and search and judge for itself; but when once the Law is made plain to the questioning heart, then *Obedience* is the single course of duty left open to each of us.

"A church which takes its stand upon the Scriptures alone, finding in them its only Confession of Faith, and leaving the individual heart and conscience free to judge of their contents, will, doubtless, to some extent be open to the charge of holding forms of belief which vary from time to time: because one man, and one generation, will vary from another in regard to points deemed of importance. This cannot be denied. But then the *remedy* for this will not be found in the imposition of creeds, however well considered and carefully composed they may be. This will certainly not prove an effectual remedy; as we may see by the example of our National Church, within which may surely be found differences of belief as great as any that can be alleged of our own community. Who has not heard of subscribing Articles in 'non-natural' senses? Who has not heard of High Church and Low Church and Broad Church; of Calvinism and its opposite Arminianism; of Puseyites and Evangelicals, and so forth; all within the limits of one and the same communion? —whose members are supposed, too, by an extraordinary fiction, to be all harmonious members of the one body of Christ, even by virtue of a common subscription to the same doctrinal formularies—but who are yet, in secret sympathies and beliefs, no more harmonious than fire and water."—Pp. 12, 13.

We have not space to speak of the corrections and alleviations which Mr. Smith suggests may be found for the evils that result from our use of religious liberty.

Of Mr. Ham's two sermons, the first is entitled, "Jesus Christ the Law of Human Life." It is able, eloquent and fearless, happily combining spiritual, doctrinal and practical views. On the spiritual Lordship of Christ, it speaks in a way which no one will misunderstand.

"I cannot see their consistency who call Jesus *Lord*, and yet believe in other Lords. Apostles spoke thus, 'To us there is *One* God the Father, and *One Lord* Jesus Christ.' 'There is *One* Mediator or medial person between God and men—the Man Christ Jesus.' We of the Unitarian Church, who have vindicated at such heavy social penalties the Unity of the Father's *Godship*, ought to be equally jealous of the Unity of the Christ's *Lordship*. There is no religious sect more intolerant, more exclusive, on the subject of the One

Godship of the Father than Unitarians: and properly so. It is right to be very jealous of this great first truth of religion. Alas! for our testimony, when we get lax on the doctrine of the Divine Unity, when we begin to see, or imagine that we see, any truth in the doctrine of the Trinity. I plead for the same noble intolerance, the same logical exclusiveness, in behalf of the other great Christian verity, that Jesus Christ is the *One Lord*, and that every knee ought to bow to him as the One Lord, to the glory of God the Father."—P. 8.

In his second discourse, Mr. Ham treats of "Christ's Unity with the Father illustrated in his Moral and Spiritual Influence on Human Character and Life." With an unction not always found in Unitarian sermons, the preacher argues first for the natural constitutional unity between the human soul and God, and next for the vital moral and spiritual unity between God and Christ. The extract and illustrative note which we give from the second head will, we think, make our readers desirous of seeing the whole discourse.

"Contrary as the ecclesiastical doctrine of the Trinity is both to Scripture and reason, we cannot deny that its exaltation of Jesus Christ to a personality in the Godhead has had a most humanizing influence on Christendom, and has largely controlled and counteracted the very evil influence of that representation of God in the Trinitarian scheme which invests him with the attributes of stern and inflexible severity under the misnomer of justice. The practical influence of Trinitarianism has been to open a wide and impassable gulf between God and His creatures, and destroy the natural consciousness of filial relationship in the Christian Church towards the Supreme and beneficent Father of all men. The Churches do not trust and rejoice in *God* as a Father, but rather tremble before and turn from Him as an uncompromising and vindictive Judge,—a Being who can never be lenient and merciful, never pardon even the slightest offences in His creatures, but must always have a moral compensation or satisfaction.* Now this repulsive doctrine would have sunk Christianity into oblivion, had it not been for that other element in the Trinitarian scheme which invests the beautiful historical image of the Man Jesus with the dignity of absolute Deity. False as the whole scheme is, we cannot be blind to, nor fail to rejoice in, this compensatory dogma, which has kept before the world an image of God, such as its instincts bid it welcome and rejoice in. Taught to identify Jesus Christ with God, men have turned towards him with love, and trust, and hope, and have been saved from that abandonment of despair into which their conceptions of God would have plunged them. A most blessed circumstance is it for Christendom and civilization, that *not* the Trinitarian *Father*, but the Trinitarian *Son*, is the God of the Churches. The unity between God and Christ, irrational and unscriptural as it is, as set forth in the orthodox formulas of faith, has been the salvation of Trinitarian Christianity as a religion, and to this hour gives Trinitarianism *all the power that it has* as a religious system in the world."—Pp. 21, 22.

We hope that the sermons both of Mr. Smith and Mr. Ham will be immediately placed in the Catalogues of our Tract Societies and receive a wide circulation. They will be useful and instructive to Unitarian as well as orthodox readers, if the latter can be secured.

---

* "It is the trite and favourite reasoning of orthodox divines to represent sin as infinite, because committed against an infinite Being. Then it follows that *every* moral feeling and action in the creature towards the Creator is infinite,—love, reverence, obedience,—whatever the creature is capable of in its moral emotions and expressions is respectively infinite. We are thus driven to the logical absurdity of asserting that a finite being has infinite capabilities.

The Case of the Ilminster School, as to the Eligibility of Dissenting Trustees; with the Arguments of Counsel and the Judgment of the House of Lords. From the Short-hand Writer's Notes, with Explanatory Introduction. Pp. 48. London—Maxwell. 1860.

THIS pamphlet supplies materials for an interesting chapter in the history of religious liberty in England. The miserable resistance of the Church party at Ilminster to the introduction of Dissenters into the Trusteeship of an educational charity, has occasioned long and costly legal arguments, and at the last the cause of ecclesiastical intolerance seemed to prevail,—the appeal against the decree of the Lords' Justices having been dismissed consequent on an equality of votes in judgment, the Lord Chancellor and Lord Cranworth affirming, and Lord Chelmsford and Lord Wensleydale reversing, the liberal judgment of the Master of the Rolls. But the discussion of the subject had its rightful effect, and in a recent Act of Parliament (23 Vict. cap. 11) a practical remedy is supplied, and Trustees of endowed schools are thereby bound to admit to the benefits of the schools the children of Dissenting parents. The friends of religious liberty ought to feel grateful to those who have carried this question through the courts, and especially to Mr. Baker,* who argued the case with much zeal and ability.

Poems. By L. First, Second and Third Series. London—Whitfield.
Poems. By Linus.

IT is not in our power to keep pace with all even of the religious poetry which now issues from the press, or we should have ere this mentioned with gentle praise these three modest little volumes of L. The sentiments are always pleasing, and the versification is smooth. Now and then there is poetical fire, and our authoress (for we think L. is of the gentler sex) gains power with increased experience.

The volume which bears the name of "Linus" has some fine thoughts set forth in smooth and pleasant lines. Occasionally we fail to catch the poet's intended idea, but there is no objection of this kind to be made to "The Last of the Twelve:"

> "The Church's door was open'd wide;
> In stream'd the golden eventide;
> And radiant in the clear light bands,
> And o'er the shadows on the floor,
> Two holy men with reverent hands
> The last Apostle bore.
> The Fathers of the Church stood there,
> Bending with reverential air
> Before the Bearer of the Word,
> That old man of a hundred years,
> The living Witness of their Lord,
> The last one left of all his peers.
> This was the Gospel that they heard,
> In tones of a fond *elder* brother:
> 'My little children, love each other!'

---

* On this point we must refer to an advertisement, which our readers will find in another part of the Christian Reformer.

it is not to be wondered at that they should scoff at it, hold our faith in ridicule, and call us Kafirs or blasphemers. It is quite evident that, in making this translation, the English has merely been transposed for the *Pus'hto*, without the slightest consideration as to difference of idiom, style and arrangement of the languages. I trust the other translations of the Scriptures are better than the *Pus'hto* one, which is the most ridiculous thing I have ever met with."

It is sad to think that the inevitable difficulties and embarrassments of translating our Scriptures into the languages and dialects of the East, have been increased by the incompetency and ignorance of the men who have undertaken the difficult task.

Remembered Words from the Sermons of Rev. J. Nichols, late Pastor of the First Parish in Portland, Maine. Small 4to. Pp. 141. Boston, U.S. —Crosby and Co. 1860.

This is a beautiful volume alike in type and matter. The words remembered are chiefly memorable passages in the sermons of Mr. Nichols, written down at different times by different persons from recollection. A gentle, trusting piety pervades these *memorabilia*. Many of them shine like gems and are set in excellent taste. We will string together half-a-dozen of the smallest, picking them up almost at random:

"There is a peculiar solemnity in going out alone by the still sea of a mighty truth, like a midnight walk by the side of the ocean."

"There is no ignorance like omission of duty. There is no knowledge like the practice of it."

"True work is hard. Hard: yes; but a particle of its diamond hardness is nobler than all the soft materials of earth's low pleasures."

"Moral effort is the necessary signature of the true Christian character."

"Would we see the depths of the ocean, we must calm the rufflings upon the surface."

"March up to grand and mighty principles, and leave little by-way calculations out of sight."

Home and College. A Public Address delivered in the Hall of the Massachusetts House of Representatives, March 8, 1860. By F. D. Huntington, Preacher to the University, &c. Boston—Crosby and Co. Small 8vo. Pp. 70. 1860.

Mr. Huntington has with no gentle hand recently broken the cords of sympathy between himself as a preacher and those who still see reason for adhering to the special religious faith he once professed. We rejoice, on meeting him on a different platform, to find that here at least we are heartily at one with him, and to know that, however unsatisfactory his defences from the pulpit of his new orthodoxy are, his harangue from the rostra in the Hall at Boston is instructive and interesting to the least orthodox of his readers. With much wisdom, kind feeling and delicate tact, he discusses the mutual relations of the youth's home and his college. He teaches parents that their antecedent duties to their sons must be faithfully performed, if those sons are to find in the college a place of moral safety and progressive intellectual culture. Admirable are all the remarks of the orator on the home training; not less so those which relate to the college training which succeeds, and

the appeals to the moral sense and intellectual ambition of the student himself. The latter and larger portion of Mr. Huntington's Address discusses the characteristic features of college experience, both as presenting points of peril and conditions of success. With equal courage and wisdom he speaks of the control of the passions, of academical insubordination, of self-respect, of emulative ambition, of the passion for popularity, of kindliness of heart, and the student's religious reverence and faith. From each of these heads of his discourse we could advantageously quote.

We learn from a passage in this Address that, like our own Oxford and Cambridge, Harvard has its practical jokes and its slang.

"Let me tell you a story, not vouching for its particulars, but as it was told to me. You all know what 'hazing' is,—and how threadbare and flat its ever repeated acts of silly violence have come to be. They say that not long ago some Sophomores, of better purpose and more humour than some of their predecessors, heard that two Freshmen in their building were fighting poverty for an education. One cold winter night, rapping loudly at their door, the Sophomores called them up, ordered them to dress, and led them upstairs blindfold to a distant room. Leaving them there for their comrades to entertain, they then returned to the bare and empty room, spread a comfortable carpet over the floor, packed the closet full of fuel, built a roaring fire in the grate, made things generally cheerful, led back the bewildered Freshmen to their own door, shoved them in, and bade them good-night. This is 'hazing' gone philanthropic. A very few such spirited jets of good feeling would revolutionize the stupidest custom that disgraces us. I have made no inquiry; but nobody here will doubt that the prophecy of this little gospel might have been easily traced in two or three cheerful, kindly, charitable homes. God multiply them!

"Seek out the families where the children are suffered to plague each other, to impose on the younger, to despotize over timid servants, or to vex animals and murder insects, and you will be sure to find the material that will stock a University with brutes. Seek the homes of happy, free-hearted charity, and you will find the antidote that will at last turn brutality itself into goodness. For, remember, in this as in other respects we have noticed, it is not the ascetic, forbidding discipline, not the gloomy or sharp-strung households, that send us the right trusty hearts and consciences. These only prepare a reaction, and let their children loose, when they send them from home, into the wild excesses of licence."—Pp. 54—57.

The Rational Primer, or First Reader. By John R. Reard, D.D. Small 8vo. Pp. 171. Manchester. 1860.

This little book is designed as a practical answer to the question, "How can I learn to read?" by a method which aims to combine attractiveness with useful instruction, and to form a storehouse of popular wisdom. It may be safely and advantageously used by all teachers in elementary schools, and is well deserving of the attention of those who instruct the lowest classes in our Sunday-schools. It is strange how few good reading-books there are for such classes. This is certainly one of the few.

INTELLIGENCE.

UPPERTHORPE UNITARIAN CHAPEL.

It is with sincere pleasure we learn that the zealous labours of our friends at Sheffield, under the guidance of Rev. Brooke Herford, are producing important results. We reprint from the *Sheffield Independent* the following account of the proceedings on laying the foundation-stone of a second Unitarian chapel in the town.

The interesting ceremony of laying the foundation-stone of a new Unitarian chapel at Upperthorpe took place on Monday, Oct. 15. There was a numerous assembly, including the principal members of the denomination in the town and neighbourhood. Happily the weather, which had been very bad in the morning, cleared up to some extent during the ceremony. The chapel, which is situated at the bottom of the Crookes Road, will be a plain building in the Early English style, with a triple window in front and an open projecting porch, with ornamental Norman arch and niche. It is calculated to seat 550 persons, and the cost will be about £1400, nearly the whole of which has been subscribed. Sufficient land has been leased to admit of the erection of schools adjoining the chapel at some future time. Mr. Frith is the architect, and Mr. Pearson the contractor for the erection of the building. The proceedings were commenced by the singing of a hymn, after which

Rev. J. Page Hopps said he wished to say a few words to explain what they meant by laying this foundation. They had come into that neighbourhood to do the work, because they believed that wherever men and women congregate, there ought to be a church of Jesus Christ for the worship of God; and as there was no place of worship in the neighbourhood, they had thought they could not do better than go there. This was to be a Christian church, built for the worship of the one true, living God, our Heavenly Father, and to the praise of Jesus Christ, our Saviour. But besides building the chapel for the purposes of worship, they had a great many other things to do—a great many good works to perform. He hoped the persons who lived around would not only go to the chapel to sing hymns and hear sermons, but also to help in many a good word and work. They wanted to teach the children, and to have institutions for the benefit of the working people, so that the church might be the centre for every good work to which they could lay their hands. When the place was opened, and they found anything wanting doing, they would be ready to do it, whatever it might be. The stone bore the text, "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." If it were asked what they believed, he replied, "We believe in Jesus Christ;" if it were asked in whom they trusted, he replied, "We trust in Jesus Christ." They felt him to be the purest and noblest and best that ever blessed this poor world, and therefore they put his honoured name upon the corner-stone, and believed it and meant to practise it—in their lives following him, in their hearts loving him, in their words teaching him. This chapel would still stand after all who were now present had passed away; but what they had to do was, to set themselves to find out their work, and having found it, to do it. He had great pleasure in introducing a lady who was too well known to need any praise from him—Miss Shore.

Miss Shore then proceeded to lay the foundation-stone. It bore a cross and the following inscription: "This Corner-stone was laid Oct. 15th, 1860, by Urith Lydia Shore, of Meersbrook. 'Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.'" The trowel (presented by Mr. Geo. Dalton) and mallet (by Mr. Geo. Eadon) also bore suitable inscriptions. The stone having been lowered into its place, Miss Shore said—My friends, I feel it to be a great privilege to be called upon to aid in the erection of a church to be dedicated to the worship of God, to the honour and reverence of our Saviour, and the promotion of Christian truth. May God enlighten both preachers and hearers to know the truth, and, knowing it, to follow it!

Sir John Bowring said that, on Saturday last, the great *Times* newspaper announced in a leading article, in reference to his connection with the Unitarian body, that Unitarianism was nearly extinct. The presence of that assembly, and the event which was now being celebrated, and the initiative they were about taking, was an emphatic answer to that averment. Unitarianism extinct! No more than were the rolling of the tides or the shining of the sunbeams! The question was not, where Unitarianism is, but where is it not? It had penetrated the Universities; it was heard in the cathedrals; it was represented by the most illustrious men, in some shape or other, of every denomination. It was pervading the world; and whatever might be the differences with respect to other

truths and other doctrines, he ventured to say that the great truths of Unitarianism were recognized in every portion of the Christian world. Happily, Unitarianism was the religion of liberty, the religion of progress. Unitarians feared nothing from, they invited, investigation. They knew that no truth could be imperilled by inquiry, and they themselves would give the example, and encourage others to follow truth wherever it might lead them, and to be sure that the great God of truth, that great benignant Unity, looked with complacency upon all his creatures who were struggling to find their way to Him, who was the great representation of truth, who sat on the throne of truth, and who, for the conveyance and communication of truth to his creatures, sent his chosen messengers, of whom Jesus Christ was the greatest. The great truths of Unitarianism were not only developing themselves amongst Christians, but were also spreading more and more amongst heathen nations. He, as they knew, had been a great traveller, and he had been again and again struck with the sympathy he had found in the enlightened men of many religions with the doctrines which Unitarianism taught. It was impossible to persuade a Brahmin or a Buddhist that a child was born in impurity. They had heard that Jesus Christ blessed little children, and said, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven;" and so let them welcome the child, innocent and pure, the great trust that God had given them, the beginning of man's history, and his end would be universal redemption.

William Fisher, Esq., when called upon, hoped they would excuse him from making a speech, as he was getting too feeble. He expressed his sympathy with the proceedings of that day, but, although he had left the Church of England to become a Unitarian, he had no hostility or animosity to any church. He believed that all would have the blessing of God, whatever their creed or faith or articles, and would ultimately, by His blessing who was universal in his benevolence, be saved.

Rev. Brooke Herford said it was to him a very happy day which witnessed the erection of another Unitarian church in Sheffield, and it was one to which he had long earnestly looked forward. In calling that church "Unitarian," they were not going down there to do any narrow sectarian work, for they did not mean to imply that they were a sect, not because they would not receive into their fellowship men of any or every church, but because there was no other church in the town or neighbourhood which would receive them into its pale, or bid them God-speed as believers in Christ. It was no fault of theirs that they were a sect; but they would fain hope that the day should soon come when men should see that there were things in religion deeper and greater than mere doctrinal differences, and when the churches of Christ would be known not by narrow jealousies, but by the spirit of Christian unity and love in which Christ's church should be one. There was room enough for all. They did not wish to pull down any man's church, or to lessen the numbers attending elsewhere, but they desired to gather in those who went nowhere. They were Unitarians, and taught Unitarianism because they believed it to be the simple truth of the Saviour's doctrine; but they did not strive to build up their church because they thought that it was the only church, but because it was the one in which God had placed them, and which they were to take care of. They did not preach that other men could not be saved, that other men were not Christians as well as themselves; but they acknowledged that, if men in other churches were earnest and true-hearted, read their Bibles and tried to follow Christ, they were as much Christians as the Unitarians were, although each thought the other wrong on some points. The day would come when this spirit would pervade all churches, and mere sectarianism pass away. He prayed that time might come, when even the name Unitarian might be forgotten, not because its doctrines had ceased to be true, but because all churches should come at last to worship the true God, and so the name lose its sectarian meaning. He hoped that church would be instrumental in doing a great work there.

Another hymn (written for the occasion by Rev. J. Page Hopps) having been sung and prayer offered, the assembly separated.

The event of the day was celebrated by a soirée of a very brilliant character in the Cutlers' Hall, under the presidency of the Master Cutler. There were between 500 and 600 guests. Excellent speeches were made by the Master Cutler, Mr. Alderman Jackson, Mr. Offley Shore, Mr. Jessop, Mr. Bramley, Sir John Bowring, Mr. F. Morton, Rev. F. Bishop, Rev. M. A. Moon, Mr. Hobson, Rev. Brooke Herford, Rev. J. P. Hopps, Rev. P. W. Clayden, &c. We wish our space permitted us to report much of what was said and done on this interesting occasion.

LOWER MOSLEY STREET, MANCHESTER.

On Monday evening, October 15th, the half-yearly meeting of *parents* took place in the Lower Mosley-Street Sunday-school. Nearly 300 persons attended, and sat down

together to a substantial tea provided under the superintendence of the teachers. The people present seemed to have been collected from all parts of the city, and from their large numbers afforded an interesting proof of the value which was set upon the instruction imparted to their children. After tea, a meeting took place in the upper room, which was speedily filled by an attentive audience. The Rev. J. Drummond took the chair and made some appropriate remarks upon Christian charity. He then called upon the Rev. J. C. Street, who spoke earnestly to the parents concerning the necessity of a constant preparation for the "life everlasting," and urged upon them to be good and holy examples to their children. The Rev. R. Smith then, by illustration and argument, enforced the need of perseverance. Dr. Marcus gave an interesting sketch of the operations of the school, with especial reference to the week-evening classes; and Mr. Geo. Smith pointed out some of the special failings of children, and made some practical suggestions for their removal. The proceedings of the evening were agreeably varied by singing and recitations, which were exceedingly creditable to the young men and women who took part therein. The evening hymn and a vote of thanks to the Chairman terminated the evening's proceedings at about ten o'clock. In looking back upon the many interesting meetings of a similar character which have been held in connection with the Lower Mosley-Street schools, it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that they are of singular value in bringing parents and teachers together, and in making them mutually interested in their important duties. It would be well if such meetings were more common in connection with our Sunday-schools, for they would both directly and indirectly result in strengthening the hands of the teachers and in awakening the interest of the parents. We commend them to the serious attention of the managers of Sunday-schools.

MISSION CHAPEL, ROCHDALE ROAD, MANCHESTER.

The working of our Unitarian Domestic Missions shews that common-sense views of religion and the Bible, as represented in Unitarian Christianity, are well adapted to the mental capacities and spiritual requirements of intelligent working men. The domestic missionaries at Manchester and other places are carrying on their good work. Chapel services on Sundays and other days, week-evening lectures, popular and innocent entertainments, temperance meetings, mutual-improvement and singing classes, Sunday and day schools, boys' and girls' classes for writing and reading, and also the young women's class during the evenings for the same purpose, the Sunday-school benefit society, and other excellent schemes for doing good, such as the library and distribution of tracts, are in active operation at the Mission chapel, in the Rochdale Road, under the care of Mr. R. W. Hopkinson.

On Monday evening, Oct. 8th, a half-yearly congregational meeting was held in the school-room beneath the chapel. A numerous and cheerful party assembled around the social board. After a simple but abundant repast, a hymn was sung; and Mr. Hopkinson was called to the chair. In his opening address, he set before his hearers the loveliness of that divine and unsectarian Christianity which opens its expansive arms of universal charity to embrace the whole family of man, and especially the humble poor. The Revds. J. C. Street and C. C. Nutter, with Mr. Shawcross, of the Parent Committee, were also present and took part in the proceedings. The Rev. C. C. Nutter explained how Christianity, rightly interpreted and understood, must be adapted to the circumstances and wants of working men and women. He referred to the circumstance that early Christianity was promoted by the sympathy and aid of pious women, and urged upon all, both male and female, the necessity and duty of faithful and earnest work, and counselled them to pursue with zeal and perseverance every good and beneficent agency upon which they had entered, and not to let their hands tire or their feet falter in the path of well-doing.

Mr. Shawcross expressed the great interest he had always felt in the success of their mission. He had never seen the institution in so efficient a condition as at present, and this he attributed to the labours of their minister and his coadjutors. His sympathies were quite in harmony with the Chairman's remarks on Christian charity, and yet, at the same time, he was of opinion that we ought not to overlook or forget the importance of a conscientious regard to what each individual after patient investigation has embraced as being to him the truth. He was an advocate for perfect freedom of opinion, combined with perfect charity towards all and for all. He shewed the application of these principles to the present condition of thought and feeling among the people.

Rev. J. C. Street, in addressing the meeting, commenced with some observations upon true Christian charity, in which he quoted the words of the great Swedish

theologian, Baron Swedenborg, that "in the spiritual world, into which every man goes after death, it is not asked, what has your faith been, or what your creed? but what has your life been?" and, further, "that all religion has relation to life, and the life of religion is to do good." He then remarked on the aggressive character of Christianity, and in doing this he took occasion to animadvert upon an opinion sometimes expressed by Unitarians, which seemed to intimate that their ministers ought not to go out into the highways and streets to preach to the people. He spoke on some of the moral aspects presented in popular cities and towns where there were large aggregations of wealth in the hands of the few, and where vast numbers of the labouring classes were necessarily thrown together. The opulent classes could build churches and chapels, and maintain services suited to their wants and tastes, but few of the working men with their wives and families entered them. He did not say that the poor were not wanted there, for it was the boast of Christianity, and not least so of Unitarian Christianity, that it was specially adapted to the poor; but the fact remained indubitable that they were not to be found there. The great majority of the people in large cities were neither directly nor indirectly connected with any section of the Christian church, and the working men who were around him could abundantly bear testimony to that fact. While Christians were content with merely a settled ministry, the duty of which was to preach Sunday after Sunday to the same or nearly the same hearers, the outlying masses of the people would never be reached. There was need of a special agency to carry Christianity to the people, an aggressive ministry, carefully prepared by a large and liberal education, and by a healthy development of generous and noble sympathies. Mr. Street then referred to an opinion which some persons seem to entertain, that any man, provided he had the "right spirit" and his "heart was in the work," was qualified for such a ministry. There never was a greater mistake. Many of the sceptical among the working classes had made themselves much better acquainted with the grounds of their unbelief than had numbers of nominal Christians with the reasons for their faith; and it was not difficult to see, if a controversy arose under such circumstances, on which side the victory would be proclaimed by those whose prejudices were already enlisted in favour of unbelief. Such men had to be confronted at every step. Then, again, in addition to all this, there were all the varieties of vice and misery which were engendered in a thick population, whose wits were sharpened by a struggle for daily bread, and whose tastes and habits were vitiated by the allurements and temptations which abounded on every side. A ministry suited to meet these various requirements would need to be furnished with every weapon from the Christian armoury. With the sword of the spirit in their hands, these men were to shew that, though Christianity was a religion of peace and contemplated that as an ultimate good, it nevertheless was an uncompromising foe of evil, and sought the destruction of evil on every hand. It was a good sign that domestic missions and missionary associations were being established, but they wanted a larger and more generous support, and ought to be multiplied in number and augmented in efficiency. Mr. Street concluded his speech with an earnest appeal to Unitarians to avail themselves of the glorious opportunities now presented to them, and to prove themselves worthy of their position and the important trust committed to them.

Mr. Lowe referred to the misrepresentations by orthodox missionaries.

Mr. Jones observed that "the fields were white already to the harvest," that Unitarians never had so grand an opportunity as now, and that from his personal acquaintance with the working class he was persuaded that the intelligent portion of them could be reached by no other means than through Unitarian Christianity.

This useful meeting was brought to a close in the usual way about ten o'clock.

UNITARIANISM IN THE NORTH OF ENGLAND.

During the last three years our churches in the North of England, from York to Newcastle, including Stockton and Sunderland, have experienced trying changes. They have passed through a period which has proved that the principles of our holy faith are not entirely dependent for their life and growth on the eloquence of one or the learning of another; that God's truth, with the maintenance of which we are charged, survives all the changes and shocks to which the mortal race, however distinguished or revered, are subject. The ministers of all these churches have been removed to different spheres of labour and some to heaven during this short period; and could we have seen this *solitary fact* of removal and loss three years ago, our doubting hearts might have paled before it. We are glad to inform our readers that Unitarianism in the North of England never seemed to hold on its way so prosperously as at the present time. Our

church at York has steadily increased in number since the settlement of the Rev. G. Vance Smith in that city. At present the church building of St. Saviourgate is undergoing a thorough renovation, and will be re-opened in the course of a month or two. The services are being held in one of the public halls of York.—The whole of our readers will be glad to hear that the beautiful church of the Divine Unity at Newcastle-on-Tyne, which lost the able and faithful services of the Rev. George Harris by death, is now again well attended, under the ministry of the Rev. W. Newton, late of Hinckley, and that the people more and more appreciate his services and express their profit under his ministration. This church has also been well cleaned, and the painted portions of it re-painted and beautified, and all is going on prosperously and pleasantly among them. We know this to be true, and that it will cheer the hearts of many of the friends of the late pastor.—Our church at Stockton-on-Tees is in a very prosperous condition: the number of seat-holders has very considerably increased. The congregation in a usual way almost fill the building, which has also been renovated during the last two years at considerable expense. Our Stockton friends are a fair pattern of what all our members should be in their attendance on worship everywhere. Almost the whole who make profession of our faith in that town are most regular in their attendance every Sabbath-day on the services of the chapel. Morning and evening the chapel is nearly filled.—Sunderland, the most recent of our Unitarian churches in the North, has had its severe struggles during the thirty years of its being. Some of those who struggled long and well in this town to establish Christian Unitarian worship went to their reward almost hopeless, at least fearing they had laboured in vain.

But we learn from the *Sunderland Times* that another effort is about to be made to establish Unitarian Christianity in that town. On Sunday, October 21, a public recognition service took place in the Unitarian chapel there, on the commencement of the ministry of Rev. A. Macdonald, M.A. In the morning, that gentleman preached from Job xxxii. 7; and in the evening, the Rev. Wm. Newton, minister of the Church of the Divine Unity, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, preached from the parable of the Sower.

On Monday night, a tea-meeting and soirée was held in the Central Hall, John Street, at which nearly 300 persons were present. The whole of the tables, eleven in number, were gratuitously supplied and presided over by the ladies of the congregation.

Rev. Mr. Spears, of Stockton, formerly minister at Sunderland, having been called to the chair, delivered an interesting address. After referring to the peculiar pleasure he felt in presiding, arising from his previous connection with the congregation, and the kind feeling which they had always shewn towards him, he sketched the struggles which they had experienced as a church, and contrasted the cheering aspects of the present with the discouraging circumstances of past though but recent days. The present meeting, he said, was the largest and most satisfactory they had ever held in Sunderland. There was, however, a danger of being unduly elated in prosperity, and he trusted that they would bear themselves as worthily in their improved position as they had struggled manfully under adverse circumstances. After some observations on the importance and responsibility of the ministerial office, he gave the right hand of fellowship to their chosen minister, Mr. Macdonald.

Mr. Gammage then presented an address on behalf of the church of Sunderland, inviting the Rev. A. Macdonald to become their permanent minister. In presenting the address, he warmly eulogized the liberal and disinterested spirit Mr. Macdonald had shewn in becoming the minister of the congregation.

Rev. Mr. Macdonald eloquently acknowledged the address. He would engage to do his best in the performance of the work assigned to him. There was much ground for encouragement. Their numbers were increasing, and he hoped the increase would soon reach a hundredfold. He had received a letter from Henry King Sparks, Esq., of Darlington, stating that he would have been glad to be present on that occasion, and assuring them of his sympathy with the cause in which they were engaged, enclosing a contribution of £5.

The meeting was subsequently addressed by the Rev. W. Newton, of Newcastle, Mr. Lucas, of Gateshead, Mr. John Wright, and several other friends.

TRANSYLVANIAN CHURCH AND STUDENTS.

The first Unitarian student from Transylvania has reached this country, and will, as soon as his familiarity with the English language enables him to do so with advantage (probably at Christmas), enter some of the classes at Manchester New College. His name is Dominick Simén; he is the son of a Transylvanian Unitarian clergyman, and is himself ordained to the ministry. The Sub-committee of the British

and Foreign Unitarian Association who have in charge the department of Transylvanian affairs, have succeeded in placing him in the family of Rev. T. L. Marshall. Next year Mr. Simén will probably be joined by a second student from Transylvania. The brightening prospects of Hungary in respect to constitutional liberty give increased importance to this part of the working of the plans of the Unitarian Association. Who can measure the advantage of a succession of liberal clergymen in Transylvania familiar with the working of English institutions, and carrying into the heart of their country the spirit of liberty and self-government so dear to Englishmen? We would remind our Unitarian friends at home that the British and Foreign Unitarian Association has undertaken new responsibilities in this matter in reliance on the general support of the body. It will help to shew to our readers what great importance is attached at Klausenburg to the reception and education of the Transylvanian students, if we print an address from the Consistory, of which Mr. Simén was the bearer:

"To the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, from the Consistory of the Unitarians in Transylvania.

"Dear Brethren in Christ,—We hail with a feeling of deep satisfaction the new link of connection which you have enabled us to form by assisting us in the maintenance of one of our students at the Manchester College in London. That sympathy which has so long existed between us on the ground of our common faith, and which you have lately so generously expressed not in words only but in deeds, will, we earnestly believe, be now placed on a firm and permanent basis, and we thank God for this new means of a closer connection between the Unitarians of England and of Transylvania. You may be assured that, firmly attached as we are to the truths of our faith, to the principles taught by Jesus Christ in the Scriptures, we rejoice in an opportunity like the present, by which we hope to see these truths and principles forwarded.

"The name of the young student who is the bearer of our present recommendation, and who is about to join your College, is Mr. Domokos Simén. May God grant that he shall spend his time there to his own profit and your satisfaction, and he may return to this country enriched with the knowledge of religious truth, and so be once a worthy labourer in the vineyard of our Master! We believe the best way in which he can express his thanks for your generous sacrifices in his behalf, is by appropriating the English modes of feeling and thinking, and by engrafting them on the native Hungarian character. That he may so be fit to work with zeal and success, and by preaching and promoting the truths of the Unitarian faith may shew himself in his works a true servant of the Lord. We recommend him.

"We cannot let this opportunity pass without thanking you for books you sent us through Mr. Paget for our library. Literature, especially theological literature, is very confined in our country, and we daily feel a greater necessity for expressing our religious ideas in words; and in the books which we have received from you we find new sources opened, from which minds eager for theological science may seek sweet nourishment.

"At the same time, we are happy to express our thanks to the respected Secretary of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, the Rev. Mr. Aspland, who has shewn so much sympathy, so much generous feeling towards the Unitarians of Transylvania, for the pleasure he has offered us in sending us the portrait of the late Rev. Mr. Wellbeloved. God bless him and the labours of the Association!

"May God be with you and with us!

"Moses Szekely, Consistorii Unitariorum Preses. et Superintendentis Locum tenens.

"Moses Papmpr, Secretary.

"Klausenbourg, Sept. 16th, 1860."

DR. CUMMING'S PROPHETIC "TRIBULATION" TRASH.

The productions of Dr. Cumming might, so far as they influence (we will not say scholars, but) persons of moderate information and common sense, be safely left to that silence which in some cases is the best rebuke; but as, in matters bearing on theology and Scripture interpretation, knowledge and common sense are not the property of the multitude, it is well that now and then a voice should be raised to warn the people against trusting in popular theological and pulpit quacks, who are as heedless of their statements as the charlatans who vend their nostrums to the gaping crowds on Tower Hill and at Smithfield. We are glad to see that a friend and esteemed correspondent has executed the needful though distasteful task of exposing Dr. Cumming's misstatements; and we reprint his letter from the *Birmingham Daily Post* of Oct. 24, as an encouragement to other friends, qualified for the task, to do something to enlighten the people on subjects on which they are by many professed teachers grossly deceived.

Dr. Cumming on Public Affairs.

Sir,—In your *Daily Post* of Friday, October 12th, you give, under the above title, a report of a lecture delivered by Dr. Cumming, at Manchester, on "The Destiny of England in the Prophetic Records."

As one who cherishes an unfeigned reverence for the Holy Bible as containing the records of a divine revelation, I am both grieved and shocked by the ignorant presumption of men who use it as a kind of "Sortes Virgilianæ" (Book of Fate), and search among its sublime disclosures of religious truth, and in the history of the people to and through whom these disclosures have been chiefly made, for mystic foreshadowings of the destiny of modern nations and potentates, which it is assumed that the Omniscient God has therein manifested to exercise the ingenuity of our modern interpreters and politicians; in both of which characters, Dr. Cumming appeals to the English public on the present and immediately prospective state of our affairs. Anything more foolish and fanatical than Dr. Cumming's exposition of scripture I have seldom met with; and the applause with which he is stated to have been received by an assembly of professing Christians, is almost enough to make one despair of ever obtaining a hearing for "the things which become sound doctrine," and fair interpretation, and common sense. However, I will not despair; but in this town, in which I am personally known to many, I will endeavour to expose the foolishness of Dr. Cumming's interpretations; not by an appeal to "every published dictionary," after his own grandiloquent fashion (for I know that I have not access to "every published dictionary," nor do I believe that he has, or could use it if he had, notwithstanding his boast)—but by specific reference to learned interpreters whom I will mention by name, and whose names will justly carry weight with every man who is in the least conversant with biblical criticism, though it would not at all surprise me to find that Dr. Cumming knows little or nothing about them.

I confine my remarks to two words which Dr. Cumming has the audacity to interpret,—the one "steam-ships" or "steam-boats," the other "steam-carriages;" and these remarks shall be as brief as possible. I deny, absolutely and unequivocally, the correctness of both these interpretations; and can only see in them an evidence of Dr. Cumming's own ignorance, or of his calculating largely on the ignorance and credulity of his audience.

1. As to "steam-ships" or "steam-boats." This is Dr. Cumming's burlesque interpretation of the original in Isaiah xviii. 2, which means "boats made of papyrus or bulrushes." Bulrushes are marsh or river plants, and are therefore very naturally designated in Hebrew by a word which means "an absorbent of water." This is the explanation given by Buxtorf and Simon in their respective Hebrew Lexicons, and by Rosenmüller in his Scholia in Vetus Testamentum, 2nda ed., Lipsiæ, 1820; the latter of whom refers to Pliny for a description of these very boats. I have read the description, and there is not a word in it which even the most perverse ingenuity could twist into a prophetic anticipation of Fulton's wonderful invention; but because both bulrushes and steam-boats have to do with water, Dr. Cumming argues that they are identical. Just as easy would it be (writes a contemporary in the *Critic*), if we might "interpret Scripture *à la* Cumming, to shew that the Doctor himself is the beast with seven heads, or Balaam's ass."

2. As to "the steam-carriage or railroad," which is Dr. Cumming's equally burlesque interpretation of what our more careful and modest translators have rendered "swift beasts" (Isaiah lxvi. 20). The original word is derived from a verb which means *to jump or leap;* and possibly, therefore, Dr. Cumming's interpretation may have been ironically designed as involving a prophetic imprecation on all such steam-carriages or railroads as are ill-laid or out of order, in consequence of which the carriages *leap* or *jump*, instead of going smoothly on their rails as they ought to do. But what would be a great fault in a railroad, or its carriages and engines, is no fault at all, but the very reverse, in that swift beast of the desert, whose natural and rapid mode of progression, which (says Simon) the French call *galop*—(in English *gallop*)—this original word most truly and graphically describes. The authorities, therefore, whom I have already cited, in concurrence with those other illustrious scripture critics, Bochart (Hierozöikon, tom. 1, p. 24, Lipsiæ, 1793) and Schultens, as quoted by Rosenmüller in his Scholia, justly render this word "dromedaries;" the camel or dromedary being one of the commonest beasts of transport employed in the East, and not likely, therefore, to have been omitted in an enumeration of various modes of transport which would be used in bringing back the Jewish exiles from Babylon "to my holy mountain Jerusalem."

I call upon Dr. Cumming to give as clear a reference as either of the foregoing to any one of the works which he professes to have examined, in confirmation of his

reported assertion that the word which I have translated *dromedaries* "literally signifies *a machine turning round with great swiftness.*" I have been unable myself to discover any such interpretation, and must continue to demur to its correctness until Dr. Cumming has produced at least plausible authority for it.

I ask, in conclusion, with the contemporary writer already quoted, "Can impudence and credulity go further?—impudence on the part of the speaker who dares talk such profane nonsense, and credulity on the part of the audience who can listen to it with applause?" I trust that there are some, at least, in Birmingham, who will sternly denounce with me both the impudence and the credulity by which Divine Revelation and its sacred records are thus travestied and profaned.

Respectfully yours,
SAMUEL BACHE,
Minister of the Congregation assembling in the New Meeting-house, Birmingham.
Edgbaston, October 22nd, 1860.

A RE-CONVERSION.

The Rev. C. H. Dall has sent us for publication a letter from Mr. W. Roberts, the Unitarian missionary at Madras, from which we print some extracts that are interesting as shewing the distinctive influence on Christian faith of some orthodox doctrines, and the necessity of Unitarianism for the successful defence of Christianity against Mahomedans and others. Mr. Roberts's letter is dated June 22nd.

"Mr. Edwin Rose, a European, who was employed in the railway as an engineer, not being satisfied with the doctrine of the Trinity, became a Mahomedan, and was named Mahommed Abdool Ady. I wished to see him, and obtained a letter from Khyroodean Khan to permit me to see the convert to Mahomedanism, who resided at one Fackeer Saib's house. The letter which was given to me was as follows: 'The bearer of this is a missionary; desires to see Abdool Ady: trust you will convert him also to our holy religion.' By means of this letter I saw Abdool Ady and another European convert to Mahomedanism on the 11th. I wished to know his reasons for embracing Mahomedanism. He made some remarks regarding the Athanasian Creed, the doctrine of the Trinity, &c. I mentioned some passages from Scripture which clearly confirm the unity of God; and then he began to talk about the missionaries who say that Christ is co-equal, co-eternal with the Father. I said that Christ disclaims all equality with the Father, and quoted some passages from Scripture, such as, 'My Father is greater than I,' 'Call no man your Father on earth,' &c.; and told him that the Athanasian Creed itself contradicts the idea of Christ being equal with the Father, and mentioned to him that place where it is said that the 'Father is unbegotten,' but regarding the Son, that he is 'begotten by the Father;' and mentioned some other passages also from Scripture, which convinced him that our blessed Lord Jesus is neither independent of the Father nor equal to Him. Afterwards he began to speak about the Comforter. His mind was entirely settled when I stated that the Comforter was promised to the disciples of Christ, and that they were directed to remain at Jerusalem till they should receive the Comforter, the spirit of truth. I informed him that the Holy Spirit is the power, energy and blessing of God; and then he wanted to know what was my opinion regarding Mahomed, since he had so widely spread the doctrine of the unity of God. I answered that I thought he understood on this point the Bible better than all Trinitarians and Roman Catholics; but as for virtue and morality, he was not a fit person to be imitated, and gave my reasons for the same. Abdool Ady was very much pleased with my conversation, and requested me to call over again on the 16th. I met them in the same place on the evening of the 16th. After speaking a little while on various subjects, they promised to call at our chapel the next day. I could find none but my dear boy Samuel to have the courage to go to a Mahomedan's house to bring them to our chapel. On the next day (Sunday) Samuel went and hired a conveyance and brought them both to the chapel. The lessons were on that date as follows: Psalms lxxxv. and lxxxvi., Deut. xxxii., John xvi. The text for my sermon was Rev. xiv. 4, 'These are they who follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth.' Subject, 'True Christian Followers of the Lamb.' This is the first English sermon that I ever delivered in our chapel. After sermon, I prepared something for their refreshment; even for a glass of water I had to pay something. In the afternoon I again provided them with a conveyance to take them back. I am glad to state that, by the power and blessing of God, Abdool Ady repented his folly of embracing Mahomedanism, quitted Fackeer Saib's house the next day, gave up his Mahomedan name and doctrine, changed his dress, assumed his former name, Mr. Edwin Rose. Under Unitarian Christian principles, may God bless and prolong his days!"

SCHOOL FESTIVAL.

ay evening, Oct. 25th, the supporters of the Day and l connected with the Unita- Hackney, assembled in con- abers to assist in a school er tea, the children were the large school-room, where . Tree, richly and tastefully ested their view, and beneath was a profusion of gifts of a amental kind. It took more rs to distribute all the pre- ras done by the pastor of the assisted by the lady teachers -school. The friends of the d their appreciation of the wenty years' continuance) of , Miss Johnson, by presenting ne-piece, a work-box, a hand- f Longfellow's Poems, and . The proceedings from first unbounded pleasure to the were, we believe, interesting

---

ISTERIAL CHANGES.

on has resigned the pulpit at Brixton, and his resignation pted by the Committee. No s yet appointed; but we un- the Committee will be happy mmunications from ministers pply the vacancy, and that ress their communications to sean, Esq., South Road, Clap- .

Brock, of Exeter, has accepted from the united congregations n and Hale, in Cheshire, and his duties there at Lady-day.

Rev. John Thomas, B.A., whose secession from the Church of England we lately mentioned, has accepted an invitation to become the pastor of the Unitarian congregation at Dudley, and has already entered on his duties there, succeeding Rev. Dr. Sam. Davison, who is, we believe, desirous of forming another pastoral engagement.

Rev. G. Heaviside, B.A., late of Manchester New College, has entered on his ministerial duties at Coventry.

Rev. Percy Bakewell, B.A., late of Manchester New College, has entered on his pastoral duties at Northampton.

Rev. R. Simpson, B.A., late of Cambridge and Manchester New College, has commenced his ministry at Horsham.

UNITARIAN MISSION CHAPEL AT HEYWOOD, LANCASHIRE.

This chapel, a kind of first fruits in Lancashire of the newly-developed missionary spirit, is to be opened by Rev. W. H. Channing on Thursday, Nov. 15th. The fact of a congregation being gathered and a chapel built in a township in which half-a-dozen years ago there was not probably a single Unitarian, shews what may be done by missionary zeal directed to the diffusion of a system of faith which is at once rational and scriptural. We are able to announce that the Committee of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association have thought the occasion one that deserves the attendance and aid of a deputation from their body. It is hoped that Mr. David Martineau, Mr. Alfred Lawrence and Mr. J. T. Hart, accompanied by the Secretary, will form the deputation on this occasion. On the following Sunday afternoon and evening, the services will be conducted by Rev. R. Brook Aspland.

OBITUARY.

at her residence in Upper et, Dublin, after an illness of MARTHA BLACKLEY, aged 65 st daughter of the late Robert the same city. This lady was l valued member of the Unita- tion of Strand Street. Strenu- upheld, both by her pen and nence, the doctrines which she righest and purest truth, she r ennobling power over her naracter by her freedom from sectarian bias, and by her rts in every field to which her could reach. Her energy in sphere to which circumstances restricted her was unremitting. Personal considerations of convenience, ease, and sometimes even of health, were set aside by her as though they existed not, when there was a question between them and the duties she had marked out for herself in a life whose abundant leisure she filled up with the best work of which her varied gifts were capable. In the schools, especially, connected with the religious society to which she belonged, did she labour for many years with unfailing love and earnestness.

Her ardent poetical temperament, chastened by many a trial from within as well as from without,—her bright intellect en-

riched by liberal culture, consecrated by Christian aspiration,—her gaiety and simplicity,—rendered her a delightful companion; while her ready promptitude to serve and please, her quick sympathy and warm affection, endeared her closely to that circle of tried friends and relatives who must long mourn her sudden removal from among them. They rejoice to believe that the faith by which she lived is now become to her "open vision," and that she may go on from strength to strength in the nearer presence of that Saviour in whom she trusted, and whose "little ones" she so loved for his sake.

Oct. 9, in Gloucester, at an advanced age, after a lingering indisposition, ELIZABETH, the wife of Samuel TAYLOR, Esq. The removal of this exemplary Christian from the world is a source of sincere regret to the members of the circle in which she moved, by whom she was esteemed for her talents and loved for her varied worth. Her survivors, however, find a solace in reflecting on the consistency with which she pursued the even tenor of her course through life, and the serenity with which she surrendered up existence at the command of her gracious Creator. Her active virtues had for many years proved the excellence of the principles she professed and by which she was actuated, whilst her patience and resignation under long protracted illness set the seal to her character. It afforded to all her friends the consolatory assurance that her work was done, her warfare accomplished, and her meetness for a better state complete.

J. G. T.

Oct. 12, at Barnet, SUSAN, the beloved wife of Mr. James Hawkins SAYER, second daughter of Mr. Charles Ellis, Maidstone.

Oct. 21, at Chester, aged 11 years, ELIZABETH MARIA, only daughter of Edward JOHNSON, Esq., of Abbot's Cottage.

At Prescot, aged 45, after a short illness, Mr. SAMUEL CALDWELL PROCTER, the only remaining son and member of the family of the late Rev. William Tulledelph Procter, formerly minister for thirteen years to the Presbyterian congregation assembling for public worship in the chapel situate in Atherton Street.

MARRIAGES.

Sept. 26, by Rev. J. Hamilton Thom, ARTHUR GREG, of Eagley, near Bolton-le-Moors, to MARGARET, eldest daughter of John LEISLER, Esq., of Victoria Park, Manchester.

Sept. 26, at Hampstead church, by Rev. William Dixon, THOMAS DIXON, Esq., of Birmingham, to MARIA LINDSAY, daughter of the late John TRAVERS, Esq., of London.

Sept. 27, at Ruddington, by Rev. C. H. Parker, Rector of Great Comberton, Worcestershire, JOHN WILLIAM MELLOR, of the Inner Temple, barrister-at-law, eldest son of John Mellor, Esq., of the Inner Temple, Q.C., M.P., of Otterspool, in the county of Herts, to CAROLINE, fourth daughter of Charles PAGET, Esq., M.P., of Ruddington Grange, in the county of Notts.

Oct. 11, at the Unitarian chapel, Stockton-on-Tees, by Rev. Robert Spears, Mr. ROBERT C. TALYNTINE, of Newcastle-on-Tyne, to Miss CLEPHAN, of Stockton-on-Tees, daughter of Mr. J. B. Clephan. At the close of the service, Mr. Spears said he had another pleasing duty to perform in the name of the congregation, and that was to present the bride with a Family Bible, and also their collection of Hymns for Home and Church, as a small token of their esteem for the bride, and of gratitude for her kind and valuable services as organist in the chapel; and that this was only a part of the testimonial the congregation would have the pleasure of handing to her to mark the occasion with their goodwill and best wishes.

Oct. 13, at Christchurch chapel, Bridgwater, by Rev. Thomas Holland, B.A., JAMES LOVIBOND to LUCY JANE POLE, both of Bridgwater.

Oct. 16, at the Crook-Street chapel, Chester, by Rev. J. K. Montgomery, WILLIAM MALIN, Esq., of Parkfield, Darley, Derbyshire, to Miss OLIVER, formerly of Derby.

Oct. 17, at the Unitarian church, Newhall Hill, Birmingham, by Mr. John Green, Mr. GEORGE DAVIS, son of Mr. William Davis, of Branston Street, to MARIA SARAH LATHAM, of Lennox Street, Lozells, Aston, daughter of the late Mr. Thomas Latham.

Oct. 18, HORACE FIELD, B.A., architect, Lincoln's Inn Fields, to CHRISTINA, daughter of the late Edward WHITE, of Queen Street, Glasgow.

Oct. 22, at Lord-Street chapel, Oldham, by Rev. C. W. Robberds, RALPH CROMPTON, to MARY ANN MOFFITT. And at the same time and place, STEPHEN BROOKES, to MARY BEESLEY,—all of Oldham.

THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CXCII.] DECEMBER, 1860. [Vol. XVI.

GEORGE HARRIS: A MEMOIR.

Chapter VII.

EDINBURGH AND NEWCASTLE.

In the autumn of 1841, Mr. Harris removed from Glasgow to Edinburgh, having in the former place accomplished a ministry of sixteen years' duration. The reasons for this removal were very obvious, and were generally considered to be satisfactory. The Edinburgh congregation had been for some time in a divided state, and was now sensibly declining. It was justly regarded as a matter of great importance to Scotch Unitarianism that its metropolitan interest should prosper, and in this crisis of affairs an extraordinary effort was necessary to be made in order that that interest might even be preserved. Such an effort was determined upon, and all eyes were turned to Mr. Harris as the minister by whose agency the desired change could best be effected. The case was thus put by the congregational committee in their report to the congregation: "Mr. Harris's universal popularity, his well-known pulpit talents, his laborious and unceasing exertions in the promotion of Unitarianism in Scotland, his intimate acquaintance with the history of the congregation, and the uniform interest he has evinced in its welfare during a long course of years, all combined in pointing to him as unquestionably the most appropriate person on whom the choice of the congregation should fall." The congregation responded to this appeal, not only by expressing their hearty approval of it, but by supporting it with great pecuniary liberality. An invitation was accordingly forwarded to Mr. Harris, which he immediately took into serious consideration, although the offer of stipend was not equal to the amount of his Glasgow income. He at the same time declined an application to settle in Manchester, notwithstanding that the salary offered to him there was greater than the one he obtained in Glasgow. The negociations which ensued terminated in his compliance with the wishes of the Edinburgh supplicants. It was, indeed, thought by most of his friends—those in Glasgow included—that, situated as he was, he could scarcely have acted otherwise than he did. He had so far built up the Glasgow cause that to all appearance it might safely be committed to other hands; and the general cause of Unitarianism in Scotland seemed

more likely to be advanced by adopting Edinburgh as the centre of influence than by continuing Glasgow in that relation. This view of the case was not destined to be verified. The removal from Glasgow was a mistake; but it was a mistake which the best exercise of sagacity at the time only appeared to confirm. The letter of acceptance which was sent to the Edinburgh congregation thus states the points on which I have touched:

"The unanimity of feeling by which your invitation is characterized is to my mind one of its chief recommendations, nor do I less appreciate the generous zeal which has led to the proposals the invitation contains. I cannot but regard these circumstances as of the happiest augury for the future harmony, prosperity and usefulness of your society. . . . . I saw not how, from the manner in which I have been for years connected with the advocacy and dissemination of the great principles of Christian truth and righteousness, not alone in Glasgow but in many other places in Scotland, I could at present leave this country in consistency with the principles and feelings by which my conduct has always been directed. . . . . I have always regarded Edinburgh as one of the most important stations in the kingdom for the diffusion of our holy and benignant faith. I have ever believed that men would gladly embrace a rational and elevating religion were its principles clearly and fully made known to them, and have deeply regretted that, from a variety of adverse circumstances, the progress hitherto made in Scotland has not been so great as might reasonably have been anticipated. . . . . I think I am warranted in my conviction that the society here is so far established and flourishing that it will be able to ensure for the future the services of an efficient minister, and consequently, for the sake of accomplishing what I hope will prove more extensive good, I feel justified in resigning my charge in Glasgow."

The Glasgow congregation thus expressed their concurrence with the step about to be taken:

"They are satisfied that it is the voice of duty which he obeys; that he leaves them because his presence seems to be indispensable in another portion of the Lord's vineyard; and however reluctantly they part from him after so long and so happy a connection, they cannot but bid him God-speed in his new sphere of Christian usefulness. They are not without consolation when they consider that Scotland, where there is so much for the Christian reformer to accomplish, is not to be deprived of his able missionary labours; that while the metropolitan congregation is henceforth to claim his more especial care, the other churches of Scotland, and their own amongst the number—all of which he has done so much to foster and uprear—will still have the advantage of his counsel and occasional ministrations. They tender him their warmest thanks for the many benefits he has conferred upon them individually and congregationally, as well as upon the cause which they are associated to promote, during the sixteen years of his ministry in this chapel; and they beg respectfully and affectionately to assure him that he will carry with him their sincerest good wishes, and long live in their most grateful recollections."*

* Christian Pioneer, Vol. XV. p. 229.

On the afternoon of Sunday, Sept. the 19th, he preached his farewell sermon in Glasgow:

"Long before the time for the commencement of worship, the chapel was crowded in every part—aisles, vestries, organ-loft, every accessible spot—whilst the entrances, both in Union Street and Melville Lane, were blocked up by hundreds unable to obtain admission. Had the chapel been twice as large, it would doubtless have been filled. There could not have been fewer than twelve hundred persons within the walls. The audience comprised individuals of all religious denominations, but unfortunately very many members of the congregation were prevented from hearing the closing service by the crowd pressing in so early. Before two o'clock Mr. Harris began the service, preaching from 2 Corinthians xiii. 11. Notwithstanding the great inconvenience which many persons must have suffered from the pressure, breathless silence prevailed and the most respectful sympathy was manifested."*

At a meeting held on the evening of the succeeding day, a testimonial, consisting of a silver salver and a purse of one hundred and fifty sovereigns, was presented to him.

The history of the rise of Unitarianism in Edinburgh bears a very striking resemblance to the correlative Glasgow history.

The Edinburgh congregation owes its origin to some individuals who in the year 1755 separated themselves from a branch of the Reformed Presbytery, as it was called, in Berwickshire. Their most marked article of belief was the doctrine that Christ died for all men; but though the body from whom they separated held this doctrine in common with them, they left its communion because they did not think it sufficiently faithful in preaching and strict in manners. In the year 1769, they held a solemn meeting at Auchencraw, at which, after "avouching the Lord to be their God as he is revealed in the Scriptures, and declaring their resolution to maintain his truth and ordinances as he shall direct," they chose by lot Mr. James Purves to be their minister, who was also appointed on their behalf "to study the languages and to examine the Scriptures in their originals." Some members having removed from the Merse to Edinburgh, formed a society there, which Mr. Purves was invited to join and assist; and on his accepting the invitation he was called to the pastoral office among them. This society took the name of *Universalist Dissenters*, and continued under Mr. Purves's ministry till his death in 1795. Mr. Purves was an Arian in his views on the Trinitarian controversy, and strongly held the tenet of universal redemption in the fullest sense of that term. After his death, the society passed through various outward changes, retaining its original character and designation, till, under the influence of Richard Wright, the Unitarian missionary, it became professedly Unitarian.

"The first time I visited the metropolis of Scotland," says Mr. Wright,

* Christian Pioneer, Vol. XV. p. 493.

"I found a congregation called Universalists, who were Antitrinitarians, though not as a society strictly Unitarian. They then met in a very inconvenient place. I delivered eight discourses among them to crowded and attentive audiences, and should have had more hearers if the place would have contained them. I had a great deal of free and friendly intercourse with the people. They would have procured a larger place for me to preach in, but one could not be obtained. There were some individuals at that time who were steady, liberal and zealous Unitarians." *

This was in 1809. In 1811, Mr. Wright came to Edinburgh again. Of this second visit he says:

"I found that Unitarianism had made some progress, and its friends had considerably increased; but unhappily some differences had arisen among them, and they were divided into two societies. The one met at the Skinners'-Hall chapel, the other in a hall at the head of the Anchor Close, High Street. According to my usual plan in such cases, I associated equally with both parties, and preached in the larger place, the Skinners'-Hall chapel, on Sundays, and in the smaller place, the hall before mentioned, on week-day evenings. The one of the places was shut when the other was open, and both congregations heard me regularly during my stay in that city. This time I delivered seventeen discourses, had many interesting conferences with parties of friends, and much edifying conversation in a more private way. I urged them to procure a minister to officiate regularly amongst them, as soon as it could be made practicable. This appeared to me the only way to effect their re-union, to preserve peace and order among them, and to give the Unitarian cause a firm footing in the second city in Great Britain. The public services were always well attended; the largest audiences were estimated at five hundred people. I was requested by the Skinners'-Hall congregation to declare the Lord's table at that place free, and afterwards to administer the Lord's Supper to all who chose to partake of it, which I accordingly did with pleasure, regarding this as another triumph of liberality." †

The establishment of Unitarianism in Edinburgh may be said to have dated from this time. It was, I believe, in 1813 that the present Dr. Southwood Smith became the minister of the congregation formed of the two parties who were thus drawn together, and his talents and acquirements contributed in a large measure to give character and stability to the interest of which he assumed the charge. In 1814, the congregation removed to a chapel at the foot of Carrubber's Close; and in 1823, a chapel in Young Street was built and opened by them. Mr. Stannus commenced his ministry in the latter place in 1831, and it having in the course of time proved too small for the people whom he gathered together, St. Mark's chapel, Castle Terrace, was erected in 1835, mainly under his personal superintendence and through his indefatigable exertions. He continued in Edinburgh till

* Wright's Missionary Life and Labours, p. 287. † Ibid. p. 288.

1838, when he was succeeded by Mr. Maclellan, who in turn gave place to Mr. Harris.

Mr. Harris entered upon his Edinburgh ministry on Sunday, October 3, 1841. He pursued the same course he had followed in Glasgow, and a particular description of his exertions would be but a repetition of what I have already said.

The effect of these exertions was, however, somewhat different from what it had formerly been. In Glasgow, the congregation was almost entirely formed by himself, and therefore remarkably sensible to his influence. In Edinburgh, he succeeded to a congregation formed under other influences, which differed widely in character among themselves. This disagreement had frequently broken out into open manifestation, and was found not by any means obedient to his attempts at reconciliation. His dogmatic statements were regarded as favourable to one party in opposition to another, rather than as adapted to clear and widen the common ground on which both parties might honourably stand. Nor had he the same hold upon the Edinburgh public which he secured upon the public in Glasgow. He could collect as large audiences in the one place as he had done in the other; but, in the present instance, those audiences did not represent the strength of the place to the degree that had been formerly realized. The consequence of all this was, that although the doctrinal lectures which were occasionally given betokened an extraordinary success, some of them being as popular as any similar efforts with which his name was elsewhere associated, the regular services were not accompanied with a corresponding prosperity. He made many praiseworthy efforts to alter this state of things, but he was not able to effect the change so as to place the church over which he presided in the relative position of advancement which his work as a whole demanded.

Perhaps none of his proceedings are remembered with more pleasure than those connected with certain fortnightly meetings for fellowship and mutual improvement which were held with the design just referred to. The place of meeting was a small hall in Brown's Square, and there were generally about thirty attendants. Mr. Harris made all other engagements give way to the fulfilment of his appointments for these meetings. He often came, after preaching at Falkirk or elsewhere, direct from the railway station, with carpet-bag in hand, that he might not on any excuse neglect them. The meetings were opened and closed with singing and prayer; anything of interest that had occurred in connection with Unitarianism at the time was related; any new work likely to engage the attention of the persons present was read; and conversation on the topics thus or otherwise suggested was freely indulged in.

It was during Mr. Harris's Edinburgh ministry that the great

ecclesiastical struggle which terminated in the Free Church disruption rose to its fiercest height. The disruption took place in 1843. It was thought that this stirring of the mind of the religious public might prove favourable to the spread of a liberal theology. There are now many evident signs that such will prove to be the case in the long run, but the first effect of the movement was to divert attention from matters of mere theology by fixing it with unnatural tenacity upon matters of church polity. As the storm settled by a separation of its elements, it left behind it a stronger profession of adherence to the Calvinistic standards of Scotch Presbyterianism than had previously existed. The Free Church had been animated to its strenuous exertions by the hope of extending throughout Scotland a uniformity of evangelical belief, and it boldly acted up to that hope; while the residuary Kirk was forced to imitate the zeal of her active and popular rival. These were not the circumstances under which the voice of the Unitarian advocate was likely to be listened to even with the ordinary regard conceded to him; and it thus came to pass that the vain expectations which had been entertained deepened the disappointment that was felt on other and more reasonable grounds.

This disappointment was the less patiently borne on account of the depressed condition of the finances of the congregation. Responsibilities relating to this matter had been undertaken which it was found difficult to meet, and the difficulty continued to exist beyond the time when it had been hoped a more prosperous state of affairs would cause it to cease. Not that improvement had not taken place. In the year previous to Mr. Harris's settlement the number of sittings taken in the chapel was 122. Nearly 100 sittings were relinquished during his short ministry through removals, deaths and other causes. Notwithstanding this diminution, however, the number of sittings taken in the last year of his ministry amounted to 214. At a congregational meeting held in March, 1844, a letter from Mr. Harris was read, in which he generously said:

"Placing undoubted reliance on the assurances of friendship and approval which I have repeatedly received from you, looking with faith and hope to the future, I ask from the congregation no guarantee as to the amount of salary for the ensuing congregational year, beginning November, 1844, and ending with October, 1845. I need not assure the congregation of my deep and heartfelt anxiety to promote by every means in my power the improvement, usefulness and prosperity of this Christian church. I rely on the Christian earnestness, regularity and zeal of the congregation in furtherance of my efforts on behalf of all that is honourable to God and morally elevating to man."

This confidence was not exercised in vain, but still the resources at command were not adequate to the requirements of the case. I mention these circumstances with this particularity

in order to strengthen what I have before said as to the greater good that might have been done had Scotch Unitarianism been freed by English liberality from its pecuniary embarrassments. The probability is that the other obstructions would have gradually given way if the removal of this had allowed for the continued application of the instrumentalities which might then have been employed. This one evil repressed and counteracted exertion in Edinburgh, as it had done in Glasgow and everywhere else. Mr. Harris left Edinburgh certainly before the experiment of his mission there had been fully tried; and he left Scotland at the same time, it being still more certain that his presence there was needful to the success of the general movement he had originated; and it is painful to reflect how greatly this change was influenced by the inevitable operation of paltry money considerations.

In the beginning of the year 1845, he received a cordial and unanimous invitation to become the minister of the Hanover-Square chapel, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. He at first declined to accede to the wishes of the congregation, but on being strongly pressed to do so, he took the question of removal into his deliberate attention. He was invited to exchange an uncertain for a certain position, and, as the uncertainties with which he had to contend rather increased than diminished, he brought himself to regard the favourable opening which presented itself as the call of Providence to a new sphere of exertion. He acted accordingly. In the course of the morning service of Sunday, February 16th, he "entered into a detailed statement of the principles, motives, hopes and purposes which led him in 1825 to devote himself to ministerial duty in Scotland in connection with the congregation at Glasgow, which subsequently induced the transference of his labours from that city to Edinburgh, and which now after much anxious deliberation impelled him to the painful announcement of his intention to resign the charge of the congregation of St. Mark's chapel at the close of the ensuing May."* Two days afterwards he accepted the Newcastle invitation.

He re-visited in April and May some of the principal places in which he had been the herald of liberal Christianity, though he was prevented from fully accomplishing his intention in this respect, which was "once more to see in their different districts *all* the brethren whom he had so often met in Christian communion and fellowship; once more to raise his testimony with theirs in behalf of long-lost truth, and join with them *all* in prayer and praise to the universal Father."

He preached a farewell sermon in Edinburgh to a very large congregation on Sunday afternoon, May 18th, from Acts xx. 27, 31, 32: "I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel

* Christian Pioneer, Vol. XIX. p. 190.

of God. Therefore watch, and remember that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears. And now, brethren, I commend you to God, and to the word of his grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified." The text was singularly apt for its present purpose. He had a right to appropriate to himself this record of apostolic fidelity, no less than to mark his own term of service by means of the number of the years of Paul's ministry at Ephesus.

On the evening of the next day, Monday, May 19th, a public entertainment was given to him. The meeting was held in the Oak Hall, Bristo Place. It was very numerously attended, and the proceedings were of the most enthusiastic description. Geo. Hope, Esq., of Fenton Barns, was called to the chair; and Mr. James Morison, one of the oldest members of the congregation, was appointed vice-president. After various addresses had been delivered, Mr. Hope presented to Mr. Harris—1, a copy of resolutions passed at a special general meeting of St. Mark's congregation, Edinburgh, accompanied by a purse containing one hundred and twenty sovereigns; 2, a memorial from the congregation of the Unitarian chapel, Glasgow; 3, a memorial from the members of the Unitarian church, Aberdeen; and, 4, a memorial from the whole body of Unitarian Christians in Scotland. These memorials and resolutions were afterwards bound together in purple morocco and sent to Mr. Harris at Newcastle, along with one hundred volumes of handsomely-bound books. It would be easy to select from the language of these documents, and of the speeches with which their presentation was accompanied, sentiments accurately expressive both of the merit of Mr. Harris's character and conduct, and of the high estimation in which he was justly held by his friends. Perhaps the commendation addressed to him by Mr. Hope is as appropriate as anything else I can choose by way of specimen of what was offered on this most interesting occasion, and it has the additional charm of that utterance of personal feeling which comes more nearly to, as it proceeds more directly from, the heart.

"When I became a member of the Unitarian body some thirteen or fourteen years ago, I found your praises, Sir, in all the churches, as the consistent, able, eloquent and indefatigable advocate of whatever tended to the glory of God or the improvement and happiness of man. For the last nine years I have had the honour of enjoying your personal friendship, and increased intimacy has raised my admiration of your great talents and pure mind. You have devoted your life to great and good works. You have ever advocated the rights of man as man, irrespective of country and of clime. You have recognized God's image in every human being; in the red Indian, the sable African, or the pale-faced European. You have beheld all as children of God, possessing souls gifted with illimitable powers of expansion. Under the tattered

garments of the beggar or the ermine of the noble, you have alike recognized a brother. You have never failed to rebuke and expose religious bigotry and intolerance and pharisaical self-righteousness under every garb. You have advocated temperance, and freedom, and enfranchisement to the millions; and you have proclaimed the rights of the masses to exchange the produce of their labour for food from every shore. Years ago, you laboured to soften down the barbarity of our criminal code and that spirit of revenge which runs through it; and now the subject is beginning to attract public attention. But, above all, you have consecrated your best and noblest powers to the advancement of the faith once delivered to the saints, the cause of Christian Unitarianism. In a word, you have shewn your love to God, whom you have not seen, by your love to your brother-man, whom you have seen. And it is my earnest wish, and I am sure that of every person present, that you may be long spared successfully to carry on your labours of love, and that in your domestic circle you may richly enjoy peace, prosperity and happiness."*

The following is a list of Mr. Harris's publications during his residence in Scotland. *Select Pieces for Reading and Recitation*, 1826. *The Progress of Reformation*, 1827. *A Word or Two with the Rev. William Thomson*, 1829. *A Letter to the Rev. Gavin Struthers*, 1830. *Remarks on the Rev. A. Harvey's Lecture*, 1831. *Christianity and Calvinism*, 1831. *Antichrist: what it is and what it is not*, 1831. *Bible Faith, or Bible Society Test?* 1832. *Public Fasts Irrational and Antichristian*, 1832. *Christianity Universal Liberty*, 1832. *Harmony of Nature, Providence and Christianity*, 1833. *Christian Worship*, 1833. *Christianity and Church-of-Irelandism*, 1835. *The Doctrines of the Reformation*, 1835. *An Appeal to the Inhabitants of Glasgow against the Misrepresentations of the Glasgow Society for the Monthly Distribution of Tracts*, 1836. *Christian Unitarianism vindicated from the Misrepresentations of J. C. Colquhoun, Esq., M.P.*, 1837. *Remonstrance addressed to the Rev. John Anderson*, 1837. *The Bible the true "Hand-book:" an Appeal to the Inhabitants of Aberdeen*, 1839. *The Question, What should Unitarians do? answered*, 1839. *The Tyranny of Church Courts*, 1839. *Christian Unitarianism, what it is and what it is not*, 1840. *Observations suggested by Circumstances attendant on the Conviction and Execution of Thomas Templeton*, 1840. *The Faith in Christ as held by Unitarians*, 1844.

When Mr. Harris departed from Scotland, he must have felt that the change he was making would in all probability be a change for life. Though in the full vigour of health and activity, he was now fifty-one years of age. His children—of whom six out of the whole number of eight survived him—were growing toward maturity. Every succeeding year would be regarded more in the light of an addition to the past than of an opening to

* Christian Pioneer, Vol. XIX. p. 295.

the future. Time had mellowed his character and deepened the religious tone of his administration. He stepped into his new circumstances as a man, after mingling in the bustle of the world without, would enter his settled abode toward the close of the day; and the result of the change was, that the last stage of his ministry was more fruitful in that edification by which a religious society is consolidated and improved than any of the former stages had been.

He entered upon his duties in Newcastle on Sunday, June 1st, 1845. The two sermons which he preached on that day were published together—one wholly and the other partially—at the urgent request of the committee of the congregation, under the title of *Love of the House of God.*

The Newcastle congregation was an old English Presbyterian interest which bore in many respects a strong resemblance to the one with which Mr. Harris had been formerly connected in Renshaw Street, Liverpool. Time had, however, altered the views and feelings of the class of persons attached to such interests; and he was invited to Newcastle on the clear understanding that he would meet with encouragement in those aggressive efforts which had in Liverpool been checked. He himself had, under the same influence of time, abated his vehemence and softened his methods of action, and was better fitted to co-operate with a conservative religious society than he was in his youth. Above all, the long and valuable ministry of the Rev. William Turner had prepared the way for the new administration which was commencing. Mr. Turner, by his literary and scientific and social efforts for the benefit of the town, had gained a strong hold upon the respect and gratitude of all classes of the inhabitants, and thus transmitted to his successor a character for general usefulness which the latter had, according to his own special qualifications, only to maintain in order to secure sympathy for what he might attempt in the advancement of his professional position.

He entered upon his work under the most favourable auspices, and immediately began the measures of reformation which he thought answerable to his resources and prospects. He re-constituted the Sunday-schools; he established a Ladies' Society for works of charity; he instituted an Equitable and Benevolent Society for the benefit of members of the congregation; and he formed the Newcastle Tract and Missionary Society. The latter organization, based upon a previous one, became a most efficient instrument for extending the operations of liberal Christianity in the north of England. Shortly after his settlement in Newcastle, he brought himself into public notice by delivering his lectures on Capital Punishment. They collected together immense audiences, comprising some of the principal inhabitants of the place, and were almost immediately repeated in the same hall for the accommodation of persons who could not gain admittance on their

first delivery. He improved this popularity by calling special attention to the distinctive principles of his Christian faith, and was very soon brought into controversy with regard to them. The Rev. Samuel Dunn, who was then a Wesleyan minister stationed at Newcastle, issued a pamphlet entitled, *Socinianism, as contained in Twenty-one Publications by the Rev. George Harris, investigated and refuted;* and it was replied to by Mr. Harris in a pamphlet entitled, *Christian Unitarianism, what it really is.*

Year after year, the course which was thus inaugurated continued to be pursued with increasing success till the goal was gained. It is unnecessary that I should follow that course in any order of date. I shall content myself with selecting one or two matters included in it which may, for their own sakes, be worthy of particular notice.

Some days of every year of his Newcastle ministry were appropriated to excursions, one of which was for the benefit of all the members of the congregation. A locality rich in natural scenery was commonly chosen, and sometimes more than one day was spent in exploring it. Mr. Harris was always the life and soul of the whole business, and he generally contrived that a religious service should be held on the occasion, conducting it in the open air if a chapel could not be procured for the purpose. On one of these excursions, Catterick, the place whose vicarage Theophilus Lindsey resigned, was visited, and a service of remarkable interest was held in a large hall in the village. The proceedings were published under the title of *Adherence to Religious Truth the Obligation and Blessedness of Man,* that being the subject of the discourse which Mr. Harris delivered in the hall. In addition to the congregational excursion, in which old and young, rich and poor, were accustomed to join, the children of the schools were invariably taken at another time a few miles from home on a similar trip by Mr. Harris himself.

The interest which he manifested in all the individuals connected with his church or attached to his faith has before been alluded to in its general form, but it cannot be passed by in its special relation to his Newcastle practice. A fellow-believer was with him a personal friend. Whenever a preacher or teacher was leaving his locality to settle elsewhere, he contrived to hold a social meeting expressive of sympathy on the departure, and to provide some testimony of respect which might always keep in memory the connection about to be severed. He thus established links of union between himself and persons in America, Australia, New Zealand, and indeed almost all over the world, of which he was constantly availing himself for beneficial purposes. He would make public mention of the deaths of former associates as they occurred, time and distance seeming never to weaken the remembrance of them in his heart. He may be said to have known every family in Northumberland, Durham and

the northern parts of Yorkshire, which held Unitarian principles. He would stop on his journeys, first at one station and then at another, and travel a few miles into the country from each, to visit individuals who, on account of distance, never attended any Unitarian chapel. He would travel some thirty or perhaps fifty miles to call, in the most remote places, upon persons holding his religious opinions, simply that he might speak to them a few words of encouragement. He went regularly to all the towns and villages where the slightest manifestation of fidelity to his cause existed, and wrote kindly letters and sent parcels of tracts, and did whatever else could be done to deepen the interest felt in that cause. He was heartily welcomed in every house he visited, and especially were his visits prized by the sick and dying. His few words, "May you have peace!" have fallen with light and strength and comfort upon many sad hearts and darkened homes. No one could look round his study and not see what his habitual feelings were in the respect I am now dwelling upon. Such a full collection of books bearing, directly or indirectly, upon the Unitarian controversy was, I suppose, not to be found in any other private library as could be seen there, and the walls of the room were covered with portraits of men distinguished for their advocacy of liberal views of Christianity. Some of these portraits were rude enough, possessing no artistic value at all; but it was on a higher principle of value that they were placed there. They had the power, whenever looked upon, of calling up admiration for truth and honesty in favour of the highest interests of man.

The mention of Mr. Harris's strong regard for persons of his own faith, leads me to refer to the disposition he cultivated toward those who differed from him in opinion. He was unaffectedly desirous of establishing the most friendly relations with men of all shades of religious belief, and he neglected no possible opportunity of shewing his goodwill to others, irrespective of their sectarian position. He took special pleasure in trying to overcome bigotry by brotherly kindness. I have heard him tell some amusing tales about his forcing a fraternal recognition upon narrowly orthodox ministers into contact with whom he was thrown, and who seemed determined to preserve toward him a severe and distant demeanour. He denounced superstition, he disliked anti-supernaturalism, he thundered against oppression, he pitied infidelity, he despised indifferentism, he was always ready to expose error, but he nevertheless cherished an affectionate feeling for men on whom, according to his estimate, one or other of these imputations rested. He himself appeared always to have made up his mind on the great doctrinal questions of Christianity, and those who heard him could not but be impressed with the oracular style in which he insisted upon his conclusions. But the dogmatism did not extend beyond the intellectual expression. This was tacitly felt by those who heard

from his lips the strongest reprobation of their own views. The reprobation never revealed an enemy's heart. His popularity was thus personal as well as official. The hearers he drew together from all denominations and all ranks of life, of whom some would come long distances to hear him, and others would hide themselves from observation when they came, were, independently of their admiration of the preacher, attracted in no small degree by fondness for the man.

I have referred to the efforts he made, on his first coming to Newcastle, in originating and re-organizing institutions in connection with his congregation. These institutions were continually added to, as time went on. He opened classes during the winter evenings for the instruction of young persons, both male and female, whose daily employments hindered them from acquiring knowledge elsewhere. A youth's library, a reading and mutual improvement class, a fellowship meeting,—these and other kindred means of social benefit were called into being by him. Nor was he ever content with merely setting them on foot. He was the most active agent in connection with them. On Sundays, when he lived at a distance from the chapel, he spent the whole day under its roof, that he might superintend or assist in the work of teaching that was going on there; and on week-days, night after night he was to be seen imparting the most elementary knowledge to the poorest of people, some of whom were literally taken out of the street. He was a constant visitor at the ragged schools; and when cholera in a very severe form attacked the town, he was engaged in going from house to house in an attempt to repel the attack, irrespective of any religious connection he had with the sufferers. He and Dr. White visited 2000 of the most miserable houses in Newcastle, a report of whose condition was drawn up by him. The destitute and afflicted of every class had in him a warm friend, who not only felt for their distress, but was ever ready to act toward its relief. He was a great leader in any benevolent enterprize that presented itself to him, but he was a diligent and patient worker besides. A short time before his death, he established "The Newcastle Unitarian Institute," which was intended to combine for the members of his own flock all the advantages of an ordinary Mechanics' Institution. The value of such work on his part is to be measured not only by its own character, but by the burden it added to the extensive occupation of time and thought which his more public duties involved. He was employed in preaching wherever missionary aid was wanted, and he was a prominent speaker at meetings of Temperance Societies and Mechanics' Institutions throughout the neighbourhood in which he lived. There was, indeed, no movement for social or political improvement to which, as far as he was permitted to do so, he did not lend a helping hand.

Perhaps the most remarkable business he engaged in was the erection of the very handsome and commodious church which was put up in place of the Hanover-Square chapel. This was, in truth, his own doing. The church was not only built during his ministry, but he was, in every efficient sense, the builder of it. He projected it; he provided for it; he overcame the difficulties connected with it; he procured the money required; he directed everything relating to its structure; he carried out its most finished details, and he cleared it at the last from debt. It will stand as his monument as long as it endures, and a most graceful and expressive monument it is. From the earliest period of his ministry in Newcastle, he entertained the idea of removing the congregation into a better locality, and erecting a place of worship more suitable to its character and prospects. This idea he brought forward from time to time, seizing every occasion which seemed favourable to its realization. In the year 1847, the accomplishment of the scheme was resolved upon, and subscriptions were entered into for its support. Obstacles of an unusual kind were thrown in its way. Expensive and harassing legal proceedings were carried forward by dissentient trustees, and the anxiety connected with them was more trying than the constant toil which the progress of the building imposed. Though these obstructions were surmounted, the end was not gained without manifestations of ill feeling which made even victory painful. Still the work went on step by step. The exact business habits of its chief conductor, his fertility in expedients, his methodical arrangements, his indomitable perseverance, were found equal to all emergencies. The manner in which he stuck to the undertaking was very remarkable. During the time when workmen were employed in raising or fitting up the edifice, he was very often among them all day, and sometimes would lengthen out his day of attendance from six o'clock in the morning till ten at night. On April 13th, 1854, the chapel was opened under circumstances of the most joyful excitement. That which Mr. Harris on the occasion called "the long-looked-for day, the hard-struggled-for day, the day of many hopes and prayers," continues to be a day of fond remembrance to all who were privileged to join in its services. Dr. Montgomery preached the first sermon—a sermon stalwart as his own figure—and the united offering of praise and prayer which seemed to come as from the heart of one man was led by Mr. Harris himself. At a meeting held on the evening of the opening day, among other interesting events, a silver salver and a purse of gold were presented to Mr. Harris as "a grateful congregational offering."

I have said that this "Church of the Divine Unity," as it was called, will always stand as his memorial-stone. There is a deeper meaning in that reference than at first sight may appear. Its erection was in all probability the remote cause of his death.

He never thoroughly recovered from the bodily and mental fatigue which, in the accomplishment of this darling purpose, he underwent. From the time of the completion of that purpose, his health was broken as it had not previously been. Before leaving the old chapel, he delivered a course of lectures on the history of Presbyterian and Unitarian Nonconformity in Newcastle. These lectures cost him immense labour, and the last of them was not given till the Sunday immediately preceding the opening of the new place of worship. The exercise of thought which was thus occasioned, in addition to the great and multifarious employments in which he was engaged in preparation for the coming celebration, produced too great a strain upon his constitution, and that at a time when he was exhausted by previous efforts of extraordinary vigour. The strong man had overtasked his strength, and could not recover from the effect of the prostration even when his burden was removed. I cannot lament over this. There is a moral appropriateness attaching to it which forbids lamentation. It is right that that for which a man lives should be also that by which he dies. It enhances the glory of the warrior that he lays down his life on the battle-field he has won. To be ourselves sacrificed on the altar of our service, is to be made in the highest and strictest sense partakers at once of the sufferings and of the glory of the Lord.

In addition to the works already mentioned, Mr. Harris, when in Newcastle, published—*The Great Business of Life, what is it?* 1847. *Christian Unitarianism New-Testament Christianity*, 1848. *The Christianity of Christ and the Christianity of the World: a Discourse delivered at the Re-opening of St. Mark's Chapel, Edinburgh*, 1848. *The Doctrine of the Trinity: a Lecture*, 1853. *The Christian Character, as illustrated in the Life and Labours of the late Rev. William Turner*, 1859. *The Christian Pioneer* was discontinued at the end of the year in which Mr. Harris left Scotland. Its place was attempted to be supplied by *The Christian Pilot*, which was commenced in Feb. 1849. This latter magazine was, if anything, made to exceed the former one in value, but, after extending over two years, its issue ceased for want of adequate support. The interest of the Pioneer as the organ of a definitely localized movement could not be secured in connection with less stimulating though more general aims.

Chapter VIII.

Death.

I approach the end. The physical deterioration I have traced to the toil and care through which Mr. Harris passed in connection with the building of the Newcastle church was seen by his friends gradually to increase, and he himself was well aware of the great imminence of the danger to which he was

exposed. In apologizing for the irregularity of his correspondence, he said, in May, 1854, "And yet the multiplied anxieties and labours of the last two years do furnish a little palliation. No one can know these but myself in all their extent of harass and weight. They have often well-nigh overwhelmed me."

I had frequent opportunities of personal intercourse with him during the last five years of his life, and I noticed almost every time I saw him that he had become visibly older. His energy lessened, and his voice lost much of its power and variety. This was the more observable in him, as he was one of those men whom one could not readily fancy as growing old. Anything like weakness seemed to interfere with his personal identity. The last time I met him was at the funeral of Mr. James Morison, of Edinburgh, in August, 1857. Mr. Morison had been intimately connected with Unitarianism in Edinburgh from the beginning of its existence there. He died at an unusually advanced age. He could remember when not a single building stood upon the site of the present New Town,—a remembrance which more strikingly marks the kind of progress it records than any other I am acquainted with. Mr. Harris had been a welcome guest in Mr. Morison's house from the days of his Glasgow studentship: and he had kept up his friendship with the family during the whole of his subsequent life. That house was, indeed, for many years an Unitarian hostel where the guests were served for the love of the truth. On hearing of Mr. Morison's death, he, without solicitation and at considerable inconvenience, resolved to pay to his venerable associate the last tribute of affection which the circumstances allowed. We walked together to the house of mourning. As he prayed, blending the past with the future in devout thanksgiving, I felt it good to be there. After the interment, I spent most of the day in his company. Our conversation was softened by the event which had caused our meeting. A deep religious tone pervaded all he said. I had before remarked that the realities of the religious life, irrespective of all matters of controversy, seemed to be more and more vividly appreciated by him; and when I parted from him on his return to Newcastle, where he had to preach the next day —for this was Saturday—though I had no apprehension I should see his face no more, I felt he was ripening for the time when the harvest should come. We talked of some disputed matters, but he was desirous of getting into a purer region than that of disputation; and, as he wrote to a valued correspondent near to this date, so he in effect now insisted—"I seek no other school than that of Christ. I ask no other light than that of the Sun of Righteousness."

As the year 1859 proceeded, he rapidly declined. At the end of March in that year I received a letter from him, in answer to an application I had made to him to preach some charity ser-

mons at Dukinfield, in which he said, "My health has been seriously shattered, but I am recovering, I hope surely, though slowly." Toward the autumn, however, recovery was much further off than it was in the spring, and it was determined that he should have total rest for a considerable time in some locality away from all ministerial duty. North Berwick, Haddingtonshire, on the east coast of Scotland, was fixed upon for this purpose, and thither he retired. His residence there did not have the desired effect. His former friends in the neighbourhood were painfully struck with the sad change that had taken place in him, and almost every one who saw him foreboded that his work on earth was nearly done.

The Rev. Edmund Kell, of Southampton, had engaged to preach for him in Newcastle on the 25th of October. Mr. Kell and he had, throughout the greater part of their lives, been warmly attached to each other. They had been fellow-students at Glasgow, and there was much accordance between them even as to peculiarities of opinion. Most of the letters from which I have quoted or shall quote in this chapter were addressed to Mr. Kell. Hearing of the visit to Newcastle, Mr. Harris wrote there, strongly urging his friend to come over to North Berwick. "It will do me good to have a crack with you, howsoever brief may be the time. We are close to the Bass Rock, the scene of many martyr confessions of liberty, and to other scenery of rich beauty. I say, come." The invitation was accepted, and I am thus able to give in Mr. Kell's words a description of him as he appeared at this time.

"My arrival was somewhat unexpected, as I had been unable to inform him of the train by which I should start from Newcastle; but I soon heard his step in the hall advancing to welcome me with that cordial grasp of the hand and warm, affectionate tone which marked his greetings with his friends, and more especially with his brother ministers. He was looking pale and thinner than when I last saw him, and his fine person was rather bent, whilst his voice was unusually low, and when excited somewhat tremulous. We conversed chiefly that evening on old scenes and friends,—memory taking us back to college days, when as a junior student in the University of Glasgow I first became acquainted with him, and knew him chiefly as a missionary opening a new cause and preaching at Greenock.

"The second day of my visit was memorable from the violent storm in which the 'Royal Charter' was dashed to pieces, and when a tremendous gale raged also on the eastern coast. The house which he occupied faced the rugged islet called the Bass Rock, and the tumultuous waves dashed in fury upon it, imparting an awful sublimity to the scene. He watched with intense interest two weather-beaten sloops which narrowly steered their course between our shore and the rock into North Berwick harbour. One of these sloops went to pieces as it made the shore, and his sympathy for the distressed mariners was very great. When the weather somewhat cleared in the afternoon, we

walked on the shore, and he seemed greatly to enjoy pointing out the more interesting spots of picturesque beauty in the neighbourhood, especially in dwelling on the strikingly bold outline and military capabilities of the Bass Rock. In the evening he entered into an earnest conversation on some of the philanthropic objects which had most interested him; and, above all, he dwelt with enthusiasm on the growth of the missionary spirit among Unitarians in various parts of the kingdom, hailing it as the omen of the progress of those views of religious doctrine which it had been the delight of his heart through life to propagate. He regarded the Home Missionary Board at Manchester as happily called into existence at the right time to co-operate in this movement. And this topic naturally led him to talk of the progress of his own congregation, and of the plans he had in view for its welfare. Among these he explained to me the objects of the Newcastle Unitarian Institute, lately established, of which he was President. I quite trembled for him when I heard of the additional labours he was preparing for himself, and saw the flickering health depicted in his countenance. It was truly touching to hear him speak of his affection for his flock. When he mentioned their considerate kindness in supplying his pulpit for him for three months in order that he might have a thorough change and recruit his health by the sea-side, his voice altogether failed, and he burst into a flood of tears."

Mr. Kell's visit gave him great pleasure, and he spoke strongly of the benefit he derived from it. Another circumstance also afforded him unusual delight. He was waited upon by some persons in North Berwick and requested to preach during his stay there. The applicants were not Unitarians, and the desire they expressed was a sincere and, under the circumstances, a very decisive testimony to the religious value in which his character and ministrations were held. As such, it was received by him with gratitude. He could not comply with the request, but it fell cheerfully upon his heart, like sunshine in the shade.

As the time of his retirement drew toward its close, he became very tired and shewed great anxiety to be at home and in his work again; and he returned to Newcastle so as to preach there on November 20th.

In the course of the first week after his return, he wrote:

"I fear you had given too bright a colouring of the state of health to which I had attained. I am indeed better, but not so strong as I had hoped to become. I look for brighter days yet to come. We have had very trying ones since our return. I got through the sermons on Sunday with great difficulty, especially in the morning. I hope to be better on Sunday next. Nothing could exceed the kindness of my friends. They hold a welcome-gathering on Wednesday evening next, the 30th of November. I hope to be equal to the occasion, and shall be glad of the after quiet."

On December 16th, he again referred to the same topics:

"I cannot give so good a report as to firmness and strength of health as I could wish. The weather has been trying since our return—thick and foggy. But I am hopeful, through Dr. Greenhow's advice and

care, as well as my patient observance of his orders, that I shall gradually improve. My congregation gave us a welcome home on the evening of November 30th. There were 300 ladies and gentlemen present. Very gratifying, but too exciting. I was home by 9.30. Last Tuesday I gave the inaugural address at the Unitarian Institute, formed in connection with our congregation at the school-rooms. This will furnish my extra labour for the winter. The school-room was crowded. The Institute is open four evenings every week. Mutual improvement society, library, religious newspapers to read, classes for languages. As to outlasting you, the decision is with the All-wise and All-merciful."

This letter was, in all probability, the last he ever penned, and it concludes with the highly characteristic reference, inserted as a postscript: "The missionary spirit goes bravely on in Lancashire, Cheshire, Yorkshire, Derbyshire." The hope which had formed the life of his life thus shot up in a flame of exultation just before life expired.

Two days afterwards, on Sunday, December 18th, he conducted the morning service in his church. It was observed that, generally throughout that service, his feebleness was not so apparent as it had been on the previous Sunday, but the particular instances of failure were more alarming than before. To a scientific judgment it was plain that he was never likely to enter the pulpit more. His text on this occasion was, "Jesus Christ our Saviour." At the close of the sermon he announced that the celebration of the Lord's Supper would take place on the next Sunday, instead of at the usual time, which was the first Sunday of the coming year. He gave as the reason for the change, that as the next Sunday fell upon the 25th of December, the celebration might serve as a double commemoration of the birth and of the resurrection of the Lord. He paused after the announcement, and then said, "I trust we shall meet to hold it." On that Christmas morning he realized the promise that "the fruit of the vine which he was not henceforth to drink" upon earth, should be drunk "new in the Father's kingdom," with the Saviour whom his dying lips proclaimed.

His last ministerial act was the dedication of two children who were brought to his house for that purpose on Monday, Dec. 19th. He had always taken peculiar pleasure in that kind of service, and the mothers of his flock were wont to attach special importance to his discharge of it. When he visited the villages in his neighbourhood, it was a point of pride to engage him in this work, and it is gratifying that he now vanishes from our sight in the divine attitude which that work suggests.

After this day he was confined to his bed and sunk very rapidly indeed, until, without any pain, he calmly and peacefully, like a tired child falling asleep, closed his eyes to this world on the 24th of December, 1859. The manner of his death was merciful. He was spared from acute suffering, and he was also

spared from, what would have been to him still more grievous, the dragging on of a useless life. His last intelligible words were about the church in which so much of his interests were centred.

His remains were committed to the tomb on Thursday, Dec. 29th, amid the sorrows of the people to whom he had so faithfully ministered. My friend the Rev. R. Brook Aspland conducted the funeral service in a manner that deepened in every heart the solemn and sacred feelings which the interment itself called forth. It was a cold, dark winter's day, accompanied with wind and rain and snow, when we carried him to his resting-place. The season and the weather seemed to harmonize with the sadness with which we thought that a standard-bearer of our little host had been struck down.

I travelled that same evening to Leeds, and as I was taking some refreshment in the inn where I stayed, the waiter told me that news had just arrived of the death of Lord Macaulay. It may be remembered, that it was matter of public remark at the time that the fact of Lord Macaulay's death was first published in Leeds. It was communicated by telegraph to Mr. Ellis, one of the executors, who happened to be there. Thus I met it that night on my way home. As I sat musing upon what I had seen and heard during the day, I could not but bring these two deaths together in my mind. One was the death of an intimate friend. With the other, I had a nearer interest than the mere admiration of literary genius could supply. I was entitled to regret it on personal grounds. Far indeed was I from instituting any comparison between the two men. The case admitted of no such comparison. There was not a single point of characteristic similarity in it. It was the diversity, not the similarity, on which I meditated. Their spheres of influence were differently constituted and widely separated: but each one in his own sphere was the centre of influence. Both spheres were equally included in God's world, and the influence exerted in both entered equally into the plan of God's providence. What each of the two possessed was given to him by that great Householder who distributes many or fewer, higher or lower, talents to his servants "according to their several ability." The poor Unitarian minister was in this respect one with the great statesman and historian. They were one here, and they will be one there. Before the judgment-throne, an equal fidelity will secure for them an equal commendation. Who shall even say which service will, in the day of final manifestation, be proved to be most intrinsically valuable? "Many that are first shall be last, and the last shall be first." But whether first or last as to the result of labour, the same sentence may be pronounced upon each. Mr. Aspland's funeral text sums up all that is really important to the issue of life. It is, that the righteous Judge should hereafter say, "Well

done, thou good and faithful servant: thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

Among the tributes to Mr. Harris's memory which were paid, Mr. Aspland's funeral sermon and a part of Mr. Kell's were published. A memoir of him, drawn up in a great measure from personal recollections, appeared in the *Christian Freeman.* I have made more than one extract from the discourse delivered in Glasgow by Mr. Crosskey; and I cannot refrain from inserting here, on account of the just estimate of character it contains, the address of the Edinburgh congregation to Mrs. Harris:

"Our Father in heaven, who doeth all things well, has in His wisdom and love seen fit to release from his labours here below, and to call home to Himself, our venerable, respected and much-loved friend, your dear departed husband. We, too, mourn for him; but we trust it is in the spirit taught to many of us by himself when, as our pastor and friend, he instructed and consoled us in those heavy trials incident to our common lot. His labours of love amongst us then, and also his words fitly spoken, and deeds of kindness done to many of us since, will long remain in our grateful recollection. His name also will ever be remembered and his memory cherished, for the dauntless courage, the fervour, power and eloquence he displayed in the public defence and propagation of our holy and benevolent faith, and which he taught no less effectually by the purity of his life in his private walk and conversation. His unwearied labours from his youth upwards constituted him for many, many years the great preacher in this country of a free and loving Christianity, so that when the history of Christian Unitarianism in Scotland shall come to be written, there will be no name more honoured amongst its first apostles than that of the Rev. George Harris. We will never again see his face or hear the tones of his voice here; he cannot come to us; but, thanks be to God! we know from the gospel of Jesus that death is only the appointed way to a higher life, and that by a like patient continuance in well-doing, and by the same ceaseless activity in every cause which tends to promote the prosperity, happiness, purity and holiness of our brother man, which so distinguished him, we may encourage the glorious hope of a blissful re-union where sorrow and death shall be no more, and where God himself shall wipe away all tears from our eyes. May He who has promised to be a Husband to the widow and a Father to the fatherless ever comfort and sustain you, is the earnest prayer of your attached friends."

It remains that I should mention the names of persons who have supplied me with information which I have used in the course of my narrative. I do so with sincere thanks to them. I lie under this kind of obligation to Mrs. Harris, Mr. James Yates, Mr. S. Thornely, Mr. Charles Ellis, Mr. Shaw, Mr. W. Boardman, Mr. George Hope, Mr. G. H. Girle, Mr. J. H. Dunn, Mr. James Gibson, Mr. P. Callender, the Rev. B. Mardon, the Rev. E. Kell, the Rev. F. Baker, the Rev. G. H. Wells, the Rev. H. Green, the Rev. C. Wicksteed, the Rev. W. M'Kean, the Rev.

W. A. Jones, the Rev. H. Hutton, the Rev. Dr. Lloyd, the Rev. H. W. Crosskey, the Rev. R. Spears and the Rev. M. Scott.

Time and space have obliged me to omit the notice of some facts which I desired to mention, and which might have made my Memoir a little more complete; but if I had inserted in it all I thought pertinent to my object, how little should I have done to set forth as it really passed the life whose course I have followed! Nothing has troubled me more, as I have proceeded with my task, than the contrast between the lengthened and varied activity which actually occurred, and the few lines of bald description into which its events have been necessarily crowded. But so, in every such an attempt as this, the case must be. The reality cannot be re-called as it was. The busy scenes of the day shrink into a faint vision of the night. "We are such stuff as dreams are made of." It is only in a silent result which flows into the general current of affairs, unmarked by the keenest eye, that the true purpose of human existence, as others have to do with it, is comprehended. There it will be found, to praise and honour and glory infinite, when the full tide of mortal interests washes the eternal shore.

ADDRESS TO THE STUDENTS OF CARMARTHEN COLLEGE, OCTOBER, 1860.

BY REV. STEPHENSON HUNTER.

It devolves on me to welcome you again to the scene of your various studies, and to offer a few words of advice and encouragement to you in respect to them. This duty I have undertaken with great pleasure, because I am strongly persuaded that I am here to co-operate with you in acquiring some of the most efficient instruments of usefulness, and consequent happiness for the whole of your future lives. The high and honourable office to which you aspire in the Christian ministry, demands the fullest development of every power with which a beneficent Creator has endowed you; and surely I need not attempt to prove to you that that office *deserves* your most persevering exertions, that you may be qualified to give fitting expression to the divine message to mankind which it will be your duty to deliver, and to advance in the highest degree those eternal interests, in regard to yourselves and others, with which you will have to do. The time is happily gone by when any apology can be necessary for urging the pursuit of secular learning on the future ministers of the gospel. There can be no religion which a rational being can consistently profess, or which it is consistent with the dignity of a rational being to promulgate, which can be injured by

the fullest development of the understanding. *They* misstate the question and fight with a shadow who talk disparagingly of a religion of the head, as compared with a religion of the heart. There is no such religion. The very existence of it would argue such a destruction of the natural balance and connection of the principles of human nature, as would constitute an insanity of the most fatal kind—an insanity which would render all religion, properly so called, impossible. But perhaps there are those who fear that the heart may be contracted in its range of lofty feeling, cooled and enfeebled in its holier sentiments and aspirations, unless the pursuit of secular learning be confined within very narrow limits, and be maintained in complete subservience to a kind of spiritual training which is independent of it, if not opposed to it. In whatever form, however, the fear of sound learning, or a contempt for it, may choose to express itself, the same radical error lies at the foundation of the argument and renders that foundation unsound. No part of human nature can by possibility receive any real accessions of power or dignity by the humiliation or feebleness of any other portion. The loftiest feelings and highest aspirations will always be found, as by a natural law, to have the closest affinity with the cultivated understanding and the clear and powerful intellect. Surely there is enough of excellence in the works, as in the nature and providence, of God, to afford a safe and profitable field for the employment of the largest and acutest understanding, and from which, in proportion to its powers, it may draw ever-increasing elements of piety and faith—those exhaustless springs of moral dignity and everlasting honour. Religion, properly so called, will ever repudiate the defence of those who represent her as being too inconsistent or too unsound to sustain the scrutiny of the cultivated mind—too nearly allied to the darkness of ignorance or superstition to bear the light of logical or scientific truth. Surely, as Newton followed the planets more closely in their orbits, and learned to estimate more accurately the power which placed them in the heavens and the wisdom which appointed their everlasting courses, no sentiment of reverence or love for the Creator and Ruler of the world was enfeebled by his growing knowledge. Surely he could say, "Our Father who art in heaven," with no less fervour, or ask for his "daily bread" with no less faith or trust, that his knowledge of Him to whom his prayer was addressed was more extended, and his conception of Him more just.

Man is made in the image of his Creator in his intellectual as in his moral nature; and in the development of the mental powers, and the increased range and vigour of their action, he approaches towards the Author of his being as surely as in the development of the moral nature itself, with its enlarged sympathies and pure affections. These are but two stages in the

moral journey of life. In the former, the aspirant to its higher stations of dignity and usefulness exercises and expands those powers which are to be the instruments of his future success, while in the latter he assumes the dignity of position and endowment for which the harmonious energy of his enlarged and well-disciplined powers adapt him, and performs the high functions which pertain to the child of God when the divine image upon his soul is most free from the clouds of this world's infirmities and the stains of its impurity.

In the present preparatory stage of your career, then, I would earnestly urge upon you diligence and perseverance in the pursuit of your secular studies,—not to the neglect of theology, with its divine sanctions and all its most momentous consequences. To that your highest energies will be devoted without any doubt and as a matter of course. But seek not to build upon the sand, or till you have laid the foundations as deeply and as strongly as your present opportunities allow. The graceful arch or the strong architrave is erected in vain, if the columns which support it have not their due harmony of proportion or the needful strength to bear their stately burden; or, to use a more familiar illustration, the farmer will look in vain for a crop that will repay his labours, if he has neglected the previous cultivation of the land upon which his seed is sown.

There is much in the character of our time which tends to suggest reflections such as these, and to give them more than ordinary importance. Never, perhaps, was it more indispensable to the religious teacher to have the powers of thought sound and vigorous, and habits of judgment cool, firm and impartial,—to possess that vigour, steadiness and self-possession, which systematic discipline alone can bestow. In the present transitional state of the theological world, there is no small risk of weak minds being robbed of their Christianity altogether. The violent and unreasonable canons of criticism to which the Scriptures are often subjected, go far, if admitted, to prove that those sacred records are worse than useless, being little better than a compound of fiction and priestcraft; while the theories of religion by which this criticism is accompanied, tracing religion wholly to the spontaneous development of the moral instincts of human nature, represent revelation to be useless, or affirm it to be impossible. Christianity, however, properly so called, must stand or fall with those records of the life of Christ which the New Testament contains; and therefore it is of great importance that the preacher of the gospel should not only have its sacred records in their integrity, and be educated in the languages in which the Scriptures were originally written, and so have the best means of understanding them, but should have knowledge and power sufficient to estimate the criticism by which they are assailed, and defend the truth which he believes to have in his

charge. I rejoice to believe that, after all the attacks of criticism by which the Scriptures have been assailed, they still stand in their integrity the genuine records of the dealings of God with the men of successive generations, and to us the divinely-sanctioned charter of our salvation, the one reliable ground of faith and hope, in time and in eternity.

Prepare yourselves, then, for defending this sacred treasure by the preparatory discipline of learning, with the power and accuracy of thought which educational discipline can bestow upon you. In the classic authors, indeed, which you will be taught to read, you will not find the principles of Christianity in their native force and just proportion. But in the languages in which they are written you will have a most valuable acquisition. For though the Greek of Xenophon be not exactly the Greek of the New or of the Old Testament, the genuine language of Greece—wonderful monument of a past civilization and key to a noble literature — will easily, to the student of the Hebrew tongue, adapt itself to the wants of the reader of the Scriptures. And in the use of it you will learn much besides. In the history and character of Socrates especially, you will see what human nature is capable of when dependent on its own resources alone, when drawing its inspiration from the deep fountains of its own intuitions exclusively, and so form a more just conclusion respecting the claim which the Scriptures make on our attention, considered as the records of revelation properly so called. For how great was the Athenian sage as a philosopher, as a politician, as a soldier, as a moralist, and yet how utterly contemptible as a teacher of religion! He could appreciate truth and honesty—nay, die for them—yet could he leave to his disciples no legacy of truth regarding God and his providence, or speak any reliable word about a present which Divine Wisdom overrules for good, or a future which Divine Goodness will make blessed. While far inferior intellects speak of glory, honour and immortality, he can only despond, and command a disciple to sacrifice a cock to Æsculapius. No wonder that the world after his death was no better than before; for though he left a life for his disciples to record, he bequeathed to the world no legacy of truth.

The moral element of mathematical learning may appear more difficult of discovery, however, than that of the Greek and Roman classics. But the habit of correct reasoning, of strict investigation, of just and legitimate inference, is no mean endowment in the theologian; for he has nice distinctions to deal with, false reasoning to expose, and principles to pursue with accuracy as well as diligence to their just consequences,—a work for which mathematical investigation will contribute in no small degree to qualify him. Is it of the nature of virtue to maintain the body in health and vigour by the choice of food and the use of exer-

cise? Yes, as certainly as that human activity may be employed in works of usefulness or of benevolence. The boy does not engage in his gymnastic exercises with any high moral purpose, nor does the spectator of his feats see anything in them beyond the salutary exercise and development of the young animal; and yet who does not acknowledge the fulfilment of a far higher purpose, when the strong muscle which that exercise expanded, and that confidence of strength which it inspired, have rescued the threatened victim of fire or flood, restored to society the promise of youth or the wisdom of age, and filled many a sorrowing heart with joy? The ingenious author of the ninth Bridgwater Treatise long ago replied to this objection to mathematical studies, which he found unnecessarily and rather offensively put forward by one of the eight who had preceded him. He took up Hume's argument on the subject of Miracles, and founded on his own calculating machine an argument in favour of revelation which would probably have made a deeper impression on the mind of the sceptic than nine-tenths of those replies which his essay called forth from professed theologians.

When we enter the domain of History, the lesson is too plain and intelligible to be misunderstood. Virtue rewarded and vice humiliated and punished are the frequent subject of a large number of novels; and notwithstanding the ultimate truth and importance of the lesson which is sought to be enforced, it frequently fails of exciting the desired interest from the feebleness or unnaturalness of the tale in which it is embodied. But with the page of history the case is wholly different. It is a leading purpose of Divine Providence to teach the same lesson, and *there* it is urged upon the attention with such a force of truth and novelty, as to keep up the interest undiminished throughout, and to stamp itself upon the memory and the heart in characters which are indelible. What great purpose of life can we set ourselves to execute, without seeing in the records of the past the obstacles, from within or from without, by which our purpose may be defeated and ourselves robbed of our reward? What passion can pervert the conscience, or agonize the heart, or overturn the order of society, the contemptibleness or the malignity of which we may not *there* study and learn in the shame and disappointment of its former victims? Or what teacher can with equal truth and power impress the lesson upon our hearts, that simplicity and sincerity of purpose, with energy and faithfulness in action, can, as the world is governed, secure every object for which the wise man will struggle? *The divine* in history is necessarily more conspicuous in the Scripture history than in any other,—if I should not rather say, in that history of which the Scriptures contain some detached and imperfect portions, but the nature and purport of which these remains sufficiently indicate,—because religious truth, with the piety and

holiness which are founded upon it, is there more prominently put forward as the end to the attainment of which the chief events in the world's government are made subservient. But not there exclusively do we learn that there is a higher Power accomplishing purposes, through the agency of men and of nations, of which the wisest actors upon the scene have had no conception, and which they have, perhaps, in a great majority of cases, only involuntarily promoted. How many a powerful hand, for example, was raised to quench that divine light which was kindled on the hills of Galilee and the crowded streets or the more quiet courts and chambers of Jerusalem; and yet it burned brighter and brighter, like the conflagration whose fuel is only stirred and its power increased by the feeble hand which cannot arrest its progress! Where shall we not find how feeble is man, considered in himself alone, as compared with those secret powers of truth with which Providence from time to time inspires the hearts of men? Nero was a monster, without character and therefore without power in a moral point of view; so that we need not wonder that he did not succeed in arresting the progress of the gospel, while he destroyed the lives of its professors. But Hadrian and M. Aurelius were great men,—great in regard of every human standard of greatness except that of religion,—and they were equally powerless in the presence of the Galilean faith, that so-called "new and noxious superstition" with which they thought themselves bound to wage war. I need not adduce examples of this truth from the history of the Reformation, though you will readily find them there, as my object is rather to point to great principles than to illustrate them, rather to excite your energy of inquiry than to gratify it. Nor will I do more than allude to that nemesis of faith and liberty that is avenging now upon the churches the wrongs of many generations, bursting the bonds in which the priest had bound the free souls of men, as if "the liberty wherewith Christ has made men free" were only a name, and, though some only talk of liberty while they hug their chains, vindicating together the rights of man and the truth of God.

Natural philosophy, in its more popular acceptation as modern science, would present a very instructive theme of remark, such as that in which I have indulged in connection with those branches of study to which your attention is of necessity more especially directed. We may justly speak of the marvels of chemical and electrical discovery, and of the history of the earth and the structure of the heavens as revealed by the geologist and the astronomer. But the purpose of my present address does not require or permit me to do more than allude to these subjects, and to express the wish that opportunities may arise of introducing you in some degree to the principles of them. All the branches of study to which I have thus alluded have for their special object,

while they convey knowledge of varying interest and importance in itself, to develop the powers of the mind, and so fit the moral agent for pursuing with success those ends of his existence which are the highest and holiest. Of all the aspects in which truth can present itself to the mind, that of religious truth is undoubtedly the most momentous. Allow me, therefore, before I conclude, to remind you that one special purpose of all your secular studies in this place is to enable you to understand the Scriptures, and to draw from them, with as much as possible of their original freshness and power, their doctrines, their promises and their precepts, for forming the inner and the outer life of yourselves and others. After all the criticism and cavil to which they have been subjected, as I have already intimated, these Scriptures still stand the authentic records of divine revelation, and consequently the only authoritative standard of faith and conduct to all who do not embrace some or other of the various forms of Deism which the last century and the present have heard promulgated. All objections to the Old Testament on scientific grounds are futile till it is shewn that Moses and the prophets professed to have divine authority for any scientific doctrines, and are found introducing their views of astronomy or cosmogony with "Thus saith the Lord." Nor, if you ever feel the weight of objections so far as to be tempted to undervalue the Scriptures, will you find any satisfaction in any of the philosophies which have been put forward to stand in their stead. If not utterly lost in the obscure terminology in which these are introduced, you will be very fortunate if you do not find yourselves carried by them into a world from which all special divine providence, if not the very God who made it, is excluded. But I do not doubt that, with the diligent use of your means of mental discipline and cultivation and a reverent regard to the sacred interests of religion, you will embrace what is really divine in science, in the world and in the Bible, and render it the instrument of everlasting good to yourselves and others.

We have received an important communication from the Registrar of the London University, to the effect that "a large proportion of the candidates who present themselves at the matriculation examination are deficient in sound elementary knowledge, more especially in regard to the grammatical structure of the languages, both classical and modern, which such candidates are required to have studied; and that no candidate will henceforth be allowed to pass this examination without satisfying the examiners by his answers to grammatical questions, as well as by his translations from Latin, Greek, French or German, into English."

You will readily see that the object of this warning is simply this,—to impress on the attention of teachers and students alike the importance of a thorough knowledge of whatever subject they

teach or learn respectively. From the very commencement of my own career as a teacher, I have become more and more satisfied of the justice, nay, of the absolute necessity, of this demand of the University. The time which is expended on a mere superficial knowledge of any subject whatever, is in a very great degree thrown away. It is not, indeed, *always* true that "a little knowledge is a dangerous thing," because a very little knowledge may yet be complete on the subject which it embraces, and may therefore possess both dignity and usefulness. But in the sense of imperfect and superficial learning, "a little knowledge" is most dangerous, puffing up its vain possessor with inordinate views of his own position and powers, while it serves no really valuable purpose,—leading to hasty and unsound conclusions, by which the light of true knowledge is shut out, and indisposing its possessor for that patient and diligent research upon which all sound knowledge depends. Learning which is deep and sound always generates humility; for the struggles by which it has been attained can hardly fail to be attended by a consciousness of the feebleness of our powers and the danger of our being misled by the narrowness or the shortness of our mental vision. But the assumed learning which has cost little effort and possesses no solidity, has no such wholesome influence upon the mind itself—dazzles its possessor and the children, old or young, who cannot estimate its worth—glitters in the sun like the boy's soap-bubble, but bursts like it, too, after its little instant of splendour, and ends in nothing.

It is often difficult, however, to estimate justly the degree of completeness which our knowledge should possess on different subjects, and the consistency of the philosophic and of the Christian character often suffers from mistakes on this subject. The demonstration in geometry or the resolution of a problem in algebra must be perfect. But what calamities have been inflicted on the world by the resolution of the theologian, lay or clerical, to call his assumed proof of some mystery in his creed a demonstration, and to treat as a perverse child or a rebellious vassal every objector who questioned his premises or denied his conclusion! How many of the little philosophies of our day, on a similar principle, presume to solve the whole mystery of creation and providence, laying down, as in the x, y, z, of the mathematician, the conditions of divine and of human existence,—what must have been from eternity, and what can alone be to eternity, —banishing even a God from the universe, if his existence or his active energy interfere with their conclusions!

On some subjects, even the completest attainable knowledge must humbly confess that the subject is too large for its comprehension, and submit with patience and humility to study on to the end, ever learning, ever conscious of much still to be learnt. There is a mystery in religion, in God and in man, in time and

in eternity, which the light even of the best human knowledge is still too feeble completely to illumine. Happy will it be for the interests of learning and of humanity, when that learning has been taught to distinguish aright the proper sphere of its activity, the proper limits of its action, the proper ends at which it may aim without danger of disappointment. Much that was mysterious to the uneducated will cease to be mystery in the light of knowledge; and that knowledge will be a blessing of unspeakable value to the world, when it has learnt rightly to distinguish between the mystery which human prejudice or presumption has placed before the sight of the free soul to screen some favourite opinion from its scrutiny, and that mystery which only the infinite distance of the Fountain of truth throws over its remoter regions—dark only to the limited vision of fleshly eye—undefined, but not contradictory—closed to mortal vision, but open to the eye of higher natures—growing less and less dark as we approach the Eternal Throne, and glorious in the reflection of the Divine wisdom and goodness when we have reached at last the Divine Presence itself.

And so, gentlemen, my subject returns into itself. I end as I began. Study diligently, faithfully. Honour sound knowledge and pursue it on every possible subject. No restraints are here sought to be imposed on your freedom of thought. Use that freedom to the utmost, always with a due regard to your own moral dignity and the dignity of the subject on which you are engaged. The old Protestant watchwords, *the sufficiency of Scripture and the right of private judgment*, have lost none of their value. Prize them always. But remember that every *right* has a *duty* attached to it, and that you are bound, while you claim the right of thinking freely, to think diligently, calmly, truthfully, in a spirit becoming the philosopher and the Christian. Then will the truth make you wise while it makes you free, and you, in return, will make the truth a blessing to men within your respective spheres of action.

FROM GOETHE.

Our inmost man we learn not from within,
Measuring ourselves by self: too small sometimes,
But oft, alas! too great. By studying man
In men we get true knowledge. Life alone
Can teach us what we are.

J. B.

REV. W. JAMES'S VISIT TO THE CONTINENT.

MY DEAR SIR, *Rome, Oct. 27, 1860.*

I HAVE not forgotten my promise to write to you, but only deferred its fulfilment until I could send you my letter from the "Eternal City." For more than a week I have been here, very busily engaged with the many objects of interest and things of beauty which are to be found in Rome, to whatever part of it one's steps are directed. To visit this place and become familiar with the remains of its ancient splendour; to look upon ruins and monuments connected with times and a people whose history forms so large and important a chapter in the annals of the past; to behold spots and localities associated with the names and memories of the mighty dead, and more particularly with the labours and persecutions of the early Christians;—all this had been a wish I had long indulged. It has now been realized. I have wandered amidst the fragments of temples and columns which once adorned the Forum. I have stood in the Coliseum and thought of its gladiatorial combats, and of the fearful scenes exhibited in its arena, when martyrs for the sake of Jesus there suffered and died. I have gazed with admiration on the Pantheon, which still stands, after more than eighteen centuries, a model of architectural skill. It has been applied, with but slight change, to Christian worship,—a sublime and glorious sanctuary in which to offer prayer and praise to the one true God. I have been to the Catacombs, have seen the graves, and read the inscriptions on the tombs—so touching, so simple and so full of hope—of those who used these subterranean excavations for purposes of sepulture, for the sacred services of religion, and for refuge from the hatred and violence of the enemies of the gospel, from the introduction of Christianity into the city and for more than three hundred years afterwards. Of course I have not failed to repair to St. Peter's, which, Byron observes,

"Of temples old, or altars new,"

stands alone, incomparable in its majesty; and it has not disappointed my expectations. Its magnitude, its grandeur, the harmony and unity which pervade its details and proportions, inspire the mind with awe and wonder, and are well fitted to raise the heart to God. I must not, however, attempt to describe this wondrous building, nor my feelings on entering it, nor indeed even to enumerate the various palaces, churches and museums, through which I have passed. I shall have much to tell you also, when we meet, of beautiful Florence and its treasures of art, and of Naples and the stirring events transpiring in that city. But I desire now especially to communicate to you some of the facts and circumstances which have come before me during my journey in relation to the state of religious thought in Italy, as well as in France and Switzerland, and to the prospects in these coun-

tries of what we believe to be a truer and purer view of the faith of Christ.

You are aware that the Brahmin* who has been commended to us by our brethren in America, and whose voice has been heard with so much pleasure in many of our churches, accompanied me in my travels; and for his sake and that of a young English friend who is with me, I remained a few days in Paris. There I had an opportunity of seeing M. Coquerel and his son. The latter, as you know, is likewise a pastor of the Reformed Church, and in perfect accordance with his gifted father in his theological opinions. I shall not soon forget the agreeable intercourse which I had with these gentlemen, nor the hopeful manner in which both spoke of the progress of liberal religious principles. It would seem that a party, similar to that designated the "Broad Church" amongst us, is to be found in the Roman Catholic Church in France. Without leaving the communion in which they have been educated, there are numbers who have outgrown Popish doctrines and agencies, and who long for Christian teaching which will more fully satisfy their minds and hearts. It is difficult, I was told, to find a thoughtful person who had not to a large extent departed from the creeds and dogmas of Romanism. But the popular forms of Protestantism, and the narrowness and bigotry with which they are too often united, will never meet the mental and spiritual needs of such individuals. They want a more rational and generous faith. The party called "Evangelical" cannot attract the most intelligent minds in other lands, any more than in our own.

My time in Paris was too short to enable me to have much intercourse with those who are zealously labouring for that spiritual emancipation of the soul which is the glory of the gospel. Unfortunately, too, neither M. Coquerel nor his son had been appointed to preach during my stay. But I heard from M. Rouville a sensible and an earnest discourse on Conscience. His congregation was small, and very late, for the most part, in assembling. It was, however, a wet Sunday, and numbers, I understood, were away by the sea-side and in the country, for health and recreation. The service was performed with much seriousness, and the sermon was delivered without notes, according to the usual practice of Protestant as well as Roman Catholic preachers on the continent. M. Rouville spoke with ease and readiness, and employed much more action than is customary in England. But there was nothing to offend the most fastidious taste, and the attention of the audience was evidently engaged and their feelings interested. When M. Coquerel preaches, his sermons are always, I hear, well attended, and at the Oratoire, I was informed, he often addresses fifteen hundred people. In the course of my conversation with this distinguished man, I

* Rev. Joguth Chunder Gangooly (baptized Philip).

ventured to express, on behalf of my brethren in England, a wish for more frequent intercourse, and for a closer acquaintance with the leaders of free religious thought in France. He said that he should be quite willing to do what he could to carry out any plan by which so desirable a result could be attained. Of very great advantage it would certainly be if only a certain and friendly communication by means of correspondence could be established between them and ourselves; and rejoiced indeed shall I be if my interview with M. Coquerel and his son shall aid in securing it.

From Paris I went to Geneva, a city, as you know, "beautiful for situation," once the centre of Calvin's power, and the place where Servetus met his death of martyrdom. Here I had the pleasure and privilege of seeing Professor Munier, and of learning from him much respecting the state of religious opinion in Switzerland. He is an able and accomplished man, and he welcomed me with great kindness, and was glad to hear something of our moral and spiritual condition in England, which he has not visited for twenty-four years.* I need not tell you that the Church of Geneva has for more than a century cast away defined and stereotyped creeds and confessions. All that is required of a minister at his ordination is a declaration of his belief in the gospel, and of his resolution to preach it according to the best understanding he is able to form of the teaching of Christ as contained in the Scriptures. This, of course, has led to much difference of opinion on doctrinal points, and to the adoption, in many instances, of sentiments very like our own. As far as I could understand, Unitarianism is not preached in an aggressive manner, but the word Trinity is seldom heard from the pulpits of the National Church, and the leading doctrines of "orthodoxy" are, no doubt, very widely relinquished. Some of the younger ministers, I believe, amongst whom there is, it must be admitted, a deep religious earnestness, are more inclined to the gloomy Calvinistic theology, and they are seeking to indoctrinate the young by their catechetical teaching. The Free Church, too, whose separation from the National took place some years ago, on grounds very similar to those which led to the separation in Scotland, is decidedly "evangelical" in its doctrine and spirit. It has made some inroads on the Establishment. But, with all its strictness and enthusiasm, it cannot prevent the exercise of independent judgment amongst its members, nor effectually hinder the spread of a more free and rational religious faith. M. Scherer, once the friend and helper of Merle D'Aubigné in this movement, has now withdrawn from him, and is the advocate of sentiments entirely opposed to those which prevail in the Free

* The year 1836, when the British Association met at Bristol. Professor Munier was the guest of my venerable predecessor, Dr. Carpenter.

Church. A complete reaction, indeed, has taken place in his mind, and he is at present maintaining and defending views, I believe, of a rationalistic tendency.

Before I left England, I had seen some sermons of M. Cougnard, one of the pastors of the Church of Geneva, which made me desirous of knowing him. I called at his house and received a cordial greeting. But, to my great disappointment, as *he* could not speak our language, and *I* was unable to carry on such a conversation with him in French as I desired, we could do little more than exchange courtesies. He is exceedingly popular as a preacher, and has considerable influence in consequence. Everywhere I heard him spoken of as a man of high character and great eloquence. He is in advance of his brethren in some of his opinions; but he fearlessly asserts and enforces his convictions of truth and duty, and his life, as I was informed, is a beautiful expression of benevolence to man and of obedience to God. M. Cougnard is not a voluminous writer. He is yet a comparatively young man. But he has sent forth one or two works from the press, and some pamphlets and tracts, which deserve to be read amongst us. The free thought of the Church of Geneva is not confined to Switzerland. To her Faculty of Theology many of the youth of the French Protestants who are to be devoted to the ministry are sent for education. And, unfettered by articles and creeds of human invention, and taught to think for themselves, they go forth to oppose religious narrowness and to uphold and defend principles which must lead to the love and practice of freedom and charity. To Professor Munier I also ventured to say how agreeable it would be to the Unitarians of England to know more of those who are so much in harmony with them in Geneva, and obtained from him a kind promise to write to me. It will, I sincerely hope, tend to our closer union with those in the city where he resides, who are believers with us in, and worshippers of, one God the Father, through the same Lord Jesus Christ.

On my arrival at Turin, I sought out M. Bert, a clergyman of talent, learning and reputation, with whom I had the honour of becoming acquainted five years ago. He is a minister in the Vaudois Church and chaplain to the Embassy in Turin. When I first saw him, it was for the purpose of making some inquiries concerning the interesting people inhabiting the valleys of Piedmont, so remarkable for their resistance in past times to Papal tyranny, and for their noble endurance on behalf of the rights of conscience. I had long been impressed with the belief that this brave and suffering Church, if its early history could be accurately traced, would be found to have embraced a simple and scriptural faith and worship, as they certainly, down to a comparatively recent period, had no Trinitarian confession. Milton, in one of his finest sonnets, alludes to the slaughtered saints whose bones

"Lie scattered on the Alpine mountains cold;
Even them who kept the truth so pure of old,
When all our fathers worshipp'd stocks and stones."

And being so near "the ancient fold" where they had borne their noble testimony, I was impelled to seek some sure knowledge respecting them. I soon perceived that I was fortunate in being directed to one so enlightened as M. Bert. From him I not only derived valuable information on the subject about which I sought his aid, but was delighted to find in Italy a Protestant minister worthy of his position in the Vaudois Church, of really liberal mind and truly catholic spirit. Even then he was, however, suspected by his brethren of latitudinarian principles, was looked upon with coldness, and annoyed by the sectarian machinery introduced into the community of which he is a member, and which he had been compelled to resist. He is a genuine lover of Christian freedom, and fearlessly asserts that every man in religion, of himself and for himself, should be left to judge that which is right. He has claimed and used this privilege in his own case, and, as is usual with those who act thus, it has issued,—I will not say in his adoption of *Unitarianism*, because he would not be altogether prepared perhaps to admit this conclusion,—but assuredly in the reception of such views of God and his providence, Christ and his mission, man and his destiny, as are sanctioned and confirmed by the plain and uniform teaching of the New Testament. I heard him preach an admirable sermon on the words of Christ to the Samaritan woman, "Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him, shall never thirst." And it will give you some notion of the tone of his mind and the catholicity of his temper, when I tell you that, had I been able to address his congregation in the language to which they are accustomed,* he would have asked me to occupy his pulpit.

From M. Bert I gathered that a lady of his congregation, the wife of an eminent physician resident at Turin, and a Unitarian Christian, hearing that I was there, wished much to see me. I therefore accompanied him to her house, and passed an evening which will not soon be forgotten. Madame M. is a woman of rare mental gifts, and moves in a sphere which brings her into contact with many of the best informed and most influential persons in the city. She had long wished for an introduction to an English Unitarian minister, and her great kindness made me feel at once "at home" with her. She is a zealous Unitarian, and knowing how many around her are growing cold and dead in their souls for want of a religion which will commend itself to their reason and their affections, she is anxious that Unitarian Christianity should be offered them in a positive and affirmative form, and in a way which will command their respect and secure their attention. I readily, of course, entered with her into the

* M. Bert always, I believe, preaches in the French language.

question, "How can this be accomplished?" Many modes of proceeding were suggested and discussed, of which I must take occasion to speak to you on my return, and, whatever may be decided on, we may be sure of her valuable co-operation.

From this interview I learned that there is at the present moment, if we were only prepared to take advantage of it, a most favourable opening at Turin for the dissemination of liberal Christianity. The most intelligent and instructed portion of the population are alienated from Popery, and will not receive the Calvinism which is offered them by the Protestant clergy of the Vaudois Church, who are almost entirely under the influence of certain persons connected with the "Evangelical party" in England. Great indifference and much unbelief are doubtless to be found in this part of Italy. But from this spiritual death, "orthodoxy" will not awaken men. They must be quickened and brought to Christian life by some other form of theology. And Unitarianism, presented to them by one whose heart is filled with the love of God and of souls, would, I am assured, meet with a ready acceptance. I have promised that books and tracts shall be forwarded to Turin, and that I will communicate with my friends there; and an opening will thus be made, I trust, for the introduction of the gospel in its purity where it is so much needed, and the way prepared for more active and decided measures for its diffusion in years to come.

From M. Bert I learned that his eldest son, who was educated at Geneva, is the pastor of a Swiss church at Genoa. A few days afterwards, being in that delightful old city, I went to the house of this young man, and passed a few hours most agreeably in his society. He was designed for the ministry amongst the Vaudois. But two or three years ago, when he was to be set apart to the office of a Christian teacher, certain suspicions arose as to his "orthodoxy," and he declined to sign the articles to which his assent was required. This gave rise to a great deal of discussion and controversy, which ended in his refusing to become the minister of a Church in which he could not have the liberty with which Christ had made his followers free. Soon afterwards, he accepted the invitation of the congregation over which he now presides. In this post he can declare the whole counsel of God, as he apprehends it. And his doctrinal standpoint appeared to me to be just that of a Unitarian minister of Dr. Channing's school of theology. It was very interesting, as you will suppose, to meet this young minister, and to hear from his lips what he is doing in this important sphere of labour. His individuality of thought and his religious convictions are disliked by the orthodox Protestants of the place, from whom he receives no consideration or attention. The members of his flock are attached to him, and are not wanting in social kindness. But he stands alone amid bigoted Romanists on the one hand and illibe-

ral Protestants on the other, and is shunned as dangerous on account of his supposed heresy. It is a trying and difficult position. But none of these things move him, and he is not depressed in spirit. Very refreshing to his mind and heart, he said, it was to meet a brother who could enter into his views; and certainly nothing has given me greater pleasure during my journey than my brief visit to him, and the opportunity thus afforded me of speaking a few words of encouragement and sympathy to one of whom I shall often think with respect and affection. I have engaged to correspond with M. A. Bert; and I cannot but hope that it may lead by and by, through the agency of the Committee of your Association, to a regular communication with him, and with others in Italy who, if not in name, are yet in all essential particulars in accordance with the Unitarian body in England.

At Florence I was favoured with introductions to several persons whose long residence in the city and peculiar aptitudes and habits have given them an extensive knowledge of the state of the people. I heard much on this subject, and fear that amongst the young men and the better-informed part of the community, there is the saddest unconcern with reference to religion. Disgusted with the superstition, falsehood and oppression, to which they have been accustomed under the name of Christianity, they have too hastily concluded that it is altogether unworthy of regard. They do not go to church, and have too often become reckless and careless in relation to moral and spiritual things,—Deists of the lowest style, and even Atheists. If ever they are to be brought to a belief in God and Christ, it must be, I am persuaded, by the exhibition of Christ and Christianity as they are set forth in the Gospels.

Naples, whilst I was in it, was full of the excitement incident to the presence of Garibaldi and his army, to the joy of deliverance from the Bourbon despotism, and to the delight awakened by the hope of a national kingdom. Battles and politics were the common topics of conversation. But even in this city, where priests and monks almost without number have been encouraged, and where one might have supposed them to be very powerful, I saw and heard enough to convince me that the Church of Rome has but little hold of the *mind* of the nation, and that faith in her ritual and attendance on her services have, as far as those who think and reason are concerned, well-nigh ceased. Father Gavazzi, who lectured frequently in England on the corruptions of Popery, has, I was informed, petitioned for a church of the Jesuits, who have been expelled from Naples, in which to exercise his ministry. He was asked on one occasion, I know, what *doctrines* he would teach; and his reply was, "Simply those of the Apostles' Creed." These, he was reminded, were not in harmony with Trinitarianism. He answered, that to him they appeared to be most in unison with the Christian Scriptures. If his request be granted, he will be sure to collect a large congre-

gation, on account of his eloquence as a speaker. And if he be a good man, we must surely wish him success in his mission; for the Creed called the Apostles', even as it now stands, has not in it much to which a Unitarian believer could not yield entire approval.

Rome, from which I write, is, as you will suppose, at this moment outwardly free from all opposition to existing ecclesiastical institutions. But even here, and under the shadow of the throne of him who is designated the infallible successor of St. Peter, there are not wanting proofs of a desire for religious reformation. If there is no avowed dissent from the Church of the Pope, there is assuredly a want of sympathy in many minds with it, and numbers, far greater than may be imagined, are alienated from its faith and ordinances. No direct attempt would be permitted to shew the people a "better way." But "the hour" may be near when the obstacles which are now opposed to progress and change will be removed; and then may "the man" be found, whose heart is on fire with the love of truth and of God, to labour with a holy purpose and a resolute will to diffuse the light and love of the gospel as it came from Christ and his apostles! I have been to no Italian preaching in Rome. But at Naples I heard a Dominican friar, called "Father Joseph," who was much persecuted by the late government on account of his independence of mind, and who is exceedingly popular because of his remarkable eloquence. His discourse bore immediately upon passing events, and produced a striking effect upon the crowded congregation. As he proceeded, there were frequent indications of approval; and as I looked round upon the thousands who filled the sacred edifice, and listened to their expressions of admiration, my thoughts were carried back to the ancient times of the Church when all this was more frequent. Father Joseph appeared to be about thirty years old, and is evidently a man of power. His sermon was intensely earnest. He spoke of Christ as the friend of liberty, declared that his religion was opposed to tyranny and wrong in every shape, and urged upon all the importance of carrying its blessed spirit into their various relations as men and as citizens. This is the only service I have attended in a Roman Catholic church since I left England that has conveyed to me the impression of spiritual life, and afforded me anything that I could appropriate. Even amidst all the outward beauty and attraction of St. Peter's, there is an apparent unreality, and a formalism about priests and ritual, which are very painful to my mind; and I go from the place, glorious as it is, sad and dissatisfied, and longing for the more simple worship of our own humble sanctuaries.

Before I left Bristol, I obtained from a Roman Catholic clergyman there a letter of introduction to Monsignor Talbot, who resides at the Vatican, and has some high official employment near the Pope's person. He has been most obliging in his attentions to

me, and of great assistance in many ways. Through him I had an audience of the Pope, for which last Wednesday was appointed. I was allowed to take with me Mr. Gangooly and my other young travelling companion, and we went very quietly to the palace in the morning at eleven o'clock. There we saw cardinals in their showy robes, and ministers of state and others, as they passed in and out, to and from the presence of the Pontiff. An hour had elapsed before I was summoned. I had previously ascertained that, as Protestants, there would be no special marks of reverence required from us on this occasion, and we paid the same tokens of respect which we should have done had we attended the Court at home. We found the Pope seated at a table, in the plain white ecclesiastical dress which he always wears in private, and with a calm and benignant countenance, expressive of amiability and gentleness, rather than force of character or mental vigour. He seemed to me a man about seventy years of age; and his features have not on them the traces of care and anxiety which I expected would be visible, from all he has recently had to do and to bear. Nothing could exceed the kindliness of manner with which he received me. There was not the slightest exhibition of haughtiness or coldness in word or action. He spoke naturally of what arose out of the circumstances in which we stood before him. I had been introduced as a Socinian minister from Bristol. And I ventured to say that this was a mistake; that I was not a follower of Socinus, not agreeing with him in some of his religious conclusions; that I belonged to a church which refused to be called by the name of any man, however accomplished and excellent; and that I was a *Unitarian Christian.* Hearing this, the Pope reminded me that Socinus was an Italian, and then asked if I knew anything of the history and writings of Ochinus, who was also an Italian, of the Capuchin order, but renounced the doctrines of the Catholic Church and became an Antitrinitarian. I replied that I *was* familiar with the life and the Antitrinitarian opinions of this singularly gifted man, and with his fame as a pulpit orator, and that he had likewise exercised his functions as a preacher in England. I might have told him that Ochinus sought a refuge from persecution there, and that he would probably have spent the remainder of his life in my native country, but for the death of the young king Edward, and the sad change which took place with the accession of Mary and the re-establishment of Romish doctrines. But this of course would have been rude and improper, and nothing further was said on the subject. The Pope then turned to the Brahmin, and was informed that he was soon going to Calcutta, as a Christian missionary to his native Hindoos, having renounced heathenism and embraced Unitarian views of the gospel. He did not forget the English youth who was with me, and was told that he was of the Independent denomination. This led him to make some remarks on the diversity of thought and speculation which

prevailed in the world on the subject of religion. And turning to me, he remarked, "My daily prayer is, that amid the divisions and controversies of Christendom, all may be brought to know the truth and to do it." Of course I felt that "*the truth*," as he understood it, must be the system of which he is the head and representative. But his words brought to my mind the prayer of Jesus, "Sanctify them by thy truth: *thy word is truth*;" and I said to the Pope that *his* petition was *mine* also, and that it was one in which all good Christians must cordially unite.

Thus ended our interview with a man whose name is now prominently before the world in connection with the mighty revolution which is taking place in Italy, and whose temporal rule seems destined soon to be brought to an end,—a consummation which is indeed to be greatly desired, not only for his own sake, but on account of the interests of freedom and humanity. Whatever may be the issue of the conflict, I shall always look back with pleasure on this visit to the palace of the Vatican, and feel that it was a gracious act in one occupying the high position of the Pope, and burdened with so many and such weighty cares and responsibilities, to receive a Unitarian minister, who had no claim upon his time or notice, in such a manner.

My mind is full of thoughts in relation both to politics and theology, concerning which I should like to write; but my letter, I fear, is already too long, and I must bring it to a close. On some future occasion, however, if I am permitted to resume my work at home, I must urge upon you and other brethren and friends the duty which appears to me to devolve upon us as Unitarians in relation to those in Italy who are already prepared to welcome our *sympathy*, and especially to those, a vast multitude, who, I believe, would be grateful for our *aid*. The harvest there is truly plenteous, but the labourers, alas! are few. May God raise up able, devoted and faithful servants of Christ, and send them forth into this field of labour! Italy regenerated politically will soon be ready for, and she deeply needs, a purer system of religion, a more reasonable and a loftier form of Christianity.

Believe me, yours faithfully,

WILLIAM JAMES.

THE LATE REV. PHILIP LE BRETON.

IT is with sincere regret that we record the death of the Rev. PHILIP LE BRETON, which took place at his residence in the Avenue Road, Regent's Park, on the evening of the 5th of November. Though, from his comparatively retired life, he may not have been much known beyond the immediate circle in which he moved, his society would have been valued and enjoyed by all who have any regard for simplicity, fidelity and truth. He was the son of the Very Rev. Francis Le Breton, Dean of Jersey

and Rector of St. Saviour's in that island, and was born at the rectory-house of that parish on the 7th of March, 1779. He received his early education first at a private school in Yorkshire, and next at the grammar-schools of Abingdon and Exeter, of which, in turn, Dr. Lemprière, author of the Classical Dictionary, was at that time the Head Master. At the proper age he was entered at Pembroke College, Oxford, but afterward removed to Exeter College, in the same University, where he took his degree. He was ordained by Dr. North, Bishop of Winchester; and before he obtained the living to which he was subsequently presented, he was for a short period curate of Farringdon, in Berkshire. On the decease of his father, he was appointed by the Crown to succeed him in the rectory of St. Saviour's. Here, as we are informed and may well believe, he endeared himself to his parishioners by the zealous and affectionate manner in which he fulfilled his pastoral duties; and to this day he is remembered by those of them who survive with feelings of gratitude and esteem. By judicious advice and the kindness of his nature, he was greatly successful in promoting harmony and reconciling differences.

The rectors of the parishes in Jersey are, by virtue of their office, members of the states or local legislature of the island: in this character he directed his attention to the treatment of the inmates of the prison and of the pauper lunatics, who up to that time had been shamefully neglected, and was, by his efforts, the means of bettering their condition. Before the year 1814, he began to feel doubts on the subject of the Trinity and some other doctrines of the Church of England. Whether from having come to the knowledge of this circumstance, or as an act of courtesy, a lady, the sister-in-law of the late Archbishop Magee, presented him with a copy of a work of this Prelate, written in support of the orthodox creed. Instead, however, of removing his doubts, the perusal of this book tended rather to confirm them; and at length becoming convinced in his own mind of the unscriptural nature of the doctrines referred to, he resolved upon resigning his living, with all its various comforts and advantages. He was one of a large family, with limited means, and had a wife and children dependent upon him. And though on two occasions he was offered the Deanery of the island, an office not only of dignity but of considerable emolument, he was not to be moved from his purpose, and refused to accept anything that would compromise his honour and his principles. He now removed with his family to France, intending to settle at Nancy, but was prevented from doing so by the return of Napoleon Bonaparte from Elba, who ordered all the English to leave the country immediately. He then, after suffering on this account great inconvenience and loss, came to London, where he soon made acquaintance with the Rev. T. Belsham and the Rev. R.

Aspland, from whom he received the most friendly advice and encouragement. His next step was to establish a school for boys on a more comprehensive plan than had been usually adopted. This school was opened in St. James's, Westminster; but the house which he had taken being required for the formation of Regent Street, he removed to another in the same district. Here the number of pupils rapidly increased with the increasing reputation of the school; and among those who there received instruction are many now in high positions in the learned professions as well as in commerce. After a while, owing to long-continued and excessive labour, his health began to suffer, and this, with some other reasons, induced him to give up his school and retire into private life. It is singular that, after leaving the Church, he never again entered any pulpit; but we are told that his sermons were impressive, and that his discourses in French were remarkable for the beauty of their style. Desirous of being useful where he could, he gave much of his time and attention to various institutions or societies with which he became connected. As a Trustee of Dr. Williams's Library, and as one of the Committee of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, his judgment and counsel were greatly respected and valued. As a member of the Council of University Hall, he took an active part in its proceedings, and in the erection of the building his practical talent was of great service. He also interested himself in the establishment of the Ladies' College in Bedford Square, and rendered to it important assistance. In 1832, he had the misfortune to lose his wife, an amiable and estimable woman, to whom he was most warmly attached. This bereavement was felt by him as one of his severest afflictions. Two of his daughters, very dear to him, died at an early age; and his youngest son after a successful career in South America, where he had spent about twenty years of his life, returned to England with health so impaired as induced him to take up his residence at Torquay, in the hope of receiving benefit from its mild climate. This hope, however, was not fulfilled; and in a few years he also was taken away, leaving his father, his widow and others of his kindred, to mourn his departure from them. The surviving children of the subject of this brief memoir are two daughters and one son. The latter was married to Anna Letitia Aikin, the daughter of Mr. Charles R. Aikin, granddaughter of the late Rev. Gilbert Wakefield, and grandniece of Mrs. Barbauld, after whom she was named. His eldest daughter is the wife of H. W. Busk, Esq., of the Equity Bar; and the youngest, the only one left in his home, was his companion and comfort to the last.

As a sequel to this short outline of the history which we have been tracing, we are enabled to add the just tribute that was paid to the memory of his friend by Rev. T. Madge, at Essex-Street chapel, on Sunday morning, the 18th of November:

"Though," said the preacher, "funeral eulogiums are often vain, sometimes even hurtful, I feel, and I am sure it will be felt by all of you, that one possessing the virtues of our departed brother should not be allowed to pass from among us without a word expressive of the high estimation in which his character was held by us and by all who had the opportunity of observing it. This is the last occasion on which it would become me to indulge in idle and unfounded praise, and I will therefore speak of him with the truth which he loved. It is, then, I should imagine, scarcely possible for any one who enjoyed the privilege of his acquaintance not to think often and again of the admirable and beautiful qualities both of mind and heart by which he was distinguished. There were no false appearances about him. He lived the life of sincerity and truth. Conscience and duty were his only guides. In all important concerns he acted from the inspiration of his own soul. This was especially manifested when, as a minister of the Established Church, having been led by serious inquiry to reject as unscriptural some of its most prominent doctrines, he at once resigned his rectory, with all the higher preferment that awaited him, and cast in his lot with that religious community, so much misunderstood and misrepresented, whose principles he had for the most part adopted, and which he continued to hold, and by his consistent conduct to illustrate and adorn, to the close of his life. You can well understand how, in the view of a beneficed clergyman, there could be little inducement to profess Unitarian principles, except that which sprung from the pure, simple, unsophisticated love of truth. There was everything, on the score of mere prudential calculations, to prevent such an one from quitting the favoured regions of orthodoxy, and passing over to the unpopular side of what is called heresy. The strongest appeals were made to him by relatives and friends to dissuade him from taking a step involving apparently such hazardous consequences to his family and himself. And, no doubt, in resisting such appeals he must have felt some little anxiety, some meltings of human sorrow at the pain and disappointment which he was thus giving to those whom he loved, and also at withdrawing from a post which had the promise of much public usefulness as well as personal comfort and advantage. It is not in our nature to part with endeared associations and to separate ourselves from the paths in which we had been accustomed to walk, without wishing that, if possible, the trial might be spared us. But his noble devotion to the convictions at which he had honestly arrived overcame all difficulties, prevailed and triumphed over every worldly consideration. Costly as were the sacrifices which he made at the call of conscience, I never heard from him even the slightest allusion to them. Far from claiming any merit on account of resigning his station in the Church, with all the bright prospects of future advancement that were held

out to him, he seemed to have looked upon it as if it had only been the discharge of a simple, common duty. So humble and modest was he in performing an act which reflected upon him the highest honour. He might, no doubt, have remained in the Church, could he, like many learned divines of the present day, have satisfied himself with putting new meanings into old words, and giving to the articles and creeds which he had subscribed an interpretation directly opposed to their obvious signification and that intended by their framers; but to subterfuges like these he could not descend, and therefore followed the plain, straightforward course which his conscience dictated. Such firmness of principle combined with so much humility, such strength of will united with so much tenderness of heart, as were displayed by him, are qualities rarely to be found in the same person.

"For the space of forty years and upwards, he regularly attended in this chapel, a sincere and faithful worshiper of his God. And now that we shall see his face no more, it may be well for us all to cherish a memory so worthy of our veneration, and which some of you now present have, I trust, especial reasons to pronounce blessed. In all the relations of life he was most exemplary, always affectionate, self-forgetting and thoughtful of others. His religion manifested itself, as it always does when pure and genuine, not unseasonably and impertinently, but simply and naturally, as flowing spontaneously from the heart. Cheerful piety, readiness in doing good, unwavering rectitude of purpose and unwearied kindness of conduct, were marked features of his character. In the midst of all his devotedness to the principles which he had conscientiously embraced, he ever preserved a catholic spirit towards those who differed from him, and was as remote from uncharitableness as he was from indifference. His benevolence was at once a principle and a feeling, and was expressed by affectionate sympathy and true generosity, by the kindest attention to those who had any claim upon his friendly notice, and, according to his means, by a liberal support of useful institutions. His Christian faith, which was always firm and enlightened, gave him fortitude, patience, hope, amidst the many severe trials and afflictive bereavements which at various periods of his life he was called to endure. But his trials and conflicts are now over. He has finished his course and has entered into his rest. For himself, therefore,—on his own account,—no regrets need be indulged. But to the many who respected and loved him, and, more than all, to those who were bound to him by the dearest ties of nature, his removal from this world, quiet and peaceful as it was, can hardly appear otherwise than as a grievous loss. Still let us be grateful to God for having given us such a friend, and for the example which he has left behind him."

PAULINE HISTORY OF CEPHAS.

We are now prepared to enter upon firm ground, inasmuch as, by the correction of the readings in the Galatians by the MSS. mentioned in Conybeare and Howson's note on Gal. i. 18, we have in a former part (see C. R. for November) produced evidence that Cephas, not Peter, was the name of the Judaizing teacher who opposed Paul at Antioch and Galatia; also that it was Cephas who, following Paul into Greece, opposed him at Philippi, Thessalonica and Berea. And having, moreover, shewn that we have probability on our side when we assume (see p. 696) that Cephas followed Paul from Berea through Athens to Corinth, we have the certainty of this fact established by the evidence of these same MSS., as pointed out in the last portion of Conybeare and Howson's note, which tell us "that Cephas, not Peter, is the reading all through 1st Corinthians,"—the same reading, namely, as that of the English translation of the same Epistle in our New Testament, in which the name of Peter is nowhere to be found, while that of Cephas is therein mentioned four times (see 1 Cor. i. 12, iii. 22, ix. 5, xv. 5). I was prepared, therefore, with proof drawn from many passages in this Epistle, to shew that Cephas was really and truly the only opponent of Paul at Corinth,—Apollos, Paul's friend and assistant (see Acts xviii. 26—28), having left the field, and being with Paul at Ephesus (see 1 Cor. xvi. 12) while this Epistle was being penned. I was the more especially anxious to prove this, because Belsham and Locke (who are most properly regarded by Unitarians with respect) have in their expositions assumed, in ignorance of these MSS., that Cephas and Peter were identical, and have therefore "corrected" our Authorized Version in the four places I have mentioned, by the substitution of Peter for Cephas, contending that Paul's opponent at Corinth was a Sadducee not named in the Epistle (see Belsham on 1 Cor. i. 12).

But as it would spoil my proofs to reduce them "to a very brief outline," as you, Mr. Editor, have requested under your "Notices to Correspondents" in the last No. of the Christian Reformer, I shall refrain from the attempt; and shall here close my "Pauline History of Cephas" by remarking, that we of the nineteenth century, equally with the Jewish Christians of the first century to whom St. Peter's two Epistles are addressed (see 1 Peter i. 1), are still looking forward to a greater progress than has yet been made in the advancement of that happy period which this apostle describes (2 Peter iii. 13) as "a renovated heaven and a renovated earth wherein dwelleth righteousness;" even as Paul (2 Pet. iii. 15, 16),—whom Peter designates his "beloved brother,"—"hath, in accordance with the wisdom which has been given him, written," for us as well as for these Jewish Christians; "and not only in this Epistle to them, but in almost all his other Epistles," "wherein," Peter tells us (and his saying is true now as then), "are some things" which, "being hard to be understood" (i.e. not easily apprehended and received) by those who were "dull of hearing" (Heb. v. 11), viz. Jews "unlearned" and "unstable" converts (2 Peter iii. 15, 16), like Cephas,—"wrest as they do" (and many still do) "the Scriptures of the Old Testament to their own disadvantage."

May we hope that the key furnished by Conybeare and Howson for opening and explaining these still "mysterious" or not universally un-

derstood passages of Paul's writings to the "unlearned" and "unstable" of our day, may be taken up by abler hands than mine; and that, through such hands, "the looking forward to and hastening of the coming of the day of God" (2 Peter iii. 12), the spread of Christ's reign upon earth, may be promoted, by the sweeping away of those foggy cobwebs which the power of orthodoxy, falsely so called, has interwoven with Christianity through false interpretations of Paul's Epistles. Such, Mr. Editor, was the object of him who, in now taking leave of you and of his Pauline History of Cephas, begs to subscribe himself your obliged

Nov. 1, 1860. PETER.

ENGLISH PURITANISM CANDIDLY WEIGHED.

[THE following admirable estimates of one of the most remarkable movements of the human mind recorded in modern history, we take from Mr. Sanford's able and deeply interesting volume, entitled, "Studies and Illustrations of the Great Rebellion," a work which well deserves the general attention of all students of English history.]

"Puritanism was essentially spiritual in its conception, and only so far material in its religious agencies as seemed compatible with an entire subordination to the original idea. Resting on simple and immediate relations between God and man, it was at once anxiously and entirely obedient to what it believed to be the revealed will of God, and self-reliant and critical so far as respected the mere authority of man. It was therefore at once conservative and uncompromising. If it tore down with no gentle hand the overgrowth of tyrannical and superstitious innovation, it did so under the paramount idea of the restitution of the pure temple of God upon earth. If occasionally austere, it was always manly. If sometimes narrow, it was always earnest. If not always clear-sighted in its objects, it never limited its vision to passing events, but looked out boldly into the wider future. If intolerant of some approved English tastes, it was so in the interests of a true English spirit; if it prohibited them for the time, it rendered them innocuous in all future time. If too grave for ordinary events, it harmonized in its temper with the extraordinary work to which it believed itself divinely called. If it overthrew a church, it preserved the morality and spirit of Christianity among the nation. If it executed a King, it laid the foundation for a reconciliation between monarchy and liberty. If its errors were theoretically and practically not a few, it at least dealt with questions which would task the genius and the conscience of the ablest and noblest. We have benefited by many of its successful solutions, and have rarely ourselves added to them. It carried the philosophy of the divine and the scholar into the work of practical statesmanship, and the morality of the Bible into the court, the workshop and the camp. It reconciled the duties of public and private life by placing them both under the dictation of one common authority. It perished in its outward structure from the convulsions which it provoked, but its spirit still lives in the institutions which it rescued from destruction, and in an undemoralized national character."—Pp. 101, 102.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

The North British Review. No. LXVI. Edinburgh—T. & T. Clark.

THIS periodical has passed into new hands, and promises to be, under its new managers, a Review of the highest literary importance. It professes to uphold "liberal principles" and "to advance the cause of progress in harmony with the permanent order and benefit of society." Of the ten articles contained in the No. before us, there are four which particularly deserve attention, viz., those on "Modern Thought—its Progress and Consummation;" on "Lord Macaulay's Place in English Literature;" on "Revivals;" and on "the Martyrdom of Galileo." The first of the four is assigned by rumour to the pen of Isaac Taylor, and the last to Sir David Brewster. In it M. Biot is visited with the censure he so well deserves for having sacrificed truth in relation to Galileo to the influence of the Grand Inquisitor of Rome, whom he accidentally met at the Vatican. Galileo is absolved from the odious charge of having ridiculed and insulted his friendly patron, Urban VIII., and that Pope is vindicated from the heavier charge of having, under the influence of personal revenge, compassed the ruin of the great philosopher. In the eloquent words of the reviewer, Galileo stands "before his liberated country as the dauntless asserter of physical truth, the morning star of Italian science, and the type of Italy stretching her dungeoned limbs and girding herself for victory." The article on Revivals is, as might be expected from a journal which professes to "maintain the cause of *evangelical* Christianity," an apology for these eccentric and dangerous movements; but the moderation of its tone shews that the raking criticisms on the Ulster revival which have appeared in our own pages and elsewhere, have not been without effect. Here is an important concession: "Some movements called revivals have been little else than outbursts of fanaticism." And again: "Many revivals favourably judged of by the Evangelical churches have borne marks of human error and infirmity, sometimes in a serious degree." The article on Lord Macaulay is an earnest but discriminating eulogy on that illustrious writer. Its commendations of the great historian and essayist, the echo of the popular voice, will be sufficiently unmusical to the ears of Macaulay's detractors. On the Penn controversy, the reviewer asserts that Macaulay's answers to his critics are "altogether convincing." Regret is expressed that Lord Macaulay's triumphant vindication of his History appears only in the small seven-volume edition of his great work. Thousands will say Amen to the reviewer's closing paragraph:

"In spite of the incompleteness of his work, the name of Macaulay will have no lowly place even in the long roll of English worthies. His labours in literature have done more to spread abroad a true understanding of English history than those of any English writer, and his conduct in political life need not fear comparison with the most upright of English statesmen. It is perhaps too much to hope that another such historian will appear to tell of the past greatness of England; but we may surely entertain the expectation, that the men to whom England's future may be confided in times of trouble will have something of the masculine sense, the lofty love of truth, the unswerving adherence to principle, which ennobled the nature of Lord Macaulay."—P. 460.

We have reserved to the last Mr. Isaac Taylor's remarkable essay on Modern Thought. It is founded on Miss S. Hennell's "Thoughts in aid of Faith" and her previous publications. It is satisfactory that a writer whose opinions the reviewer regards as daring and mischievous is treated with respect and candour. Her habitual fairness and general ability are again and again admitted, and she is allowed to be in her own words the exponent of her own opinions. This is as it should be. If unbelievers are treated with the ordinary courtesies of honourable literary warfare, it may perhaps be anticipated that Unitarian Christians will be no longer made exceptions to the common rule of fair dealing. The scope of the reviewer's argument is to shew that if the tendency of modern thought is to push aside Christianity, the consummation will be downright atheism. In stay of the downward progression toward the abyss, there are three forces available. The multiform belief in and worship of invisible powers, and embodied in forms of beauty or of terror. Of these two forces, Brahminism and Buddhism are examples. The only other stay is that religion of which the Bible is the record. Polytheism is impossible in an educated community; and where the religion of the Bible is not accepted, Pantheism is the alternative and the result. This is the reviewer's summary of the intention of modern thought:

"The *purpose*, differing a little in the instance of each writer, is of this sort:—Modern Thought is labouring, in the first place, to reduce the Hebrew and Christian history to what is called 'the common level of ordinary history;' yet with a decisive preference allowed it.—Inspiration is that divine providential movement for the education of the human family, of which the ancient Buddhism was an eminent sample, and the Greek poetry and philosophy another sample.—As to the inspiration of the Prophets and Apostles, it was directed to a higher end; and thence the strength and permanence of the hold it has taken of the modern mind, among all civilized nations. So it is therefore—and this is the next purpose in view—that we may still consistently profess ourselves to be Christians; we may sign articles of religion; we may recite creeds; we may preach sermons; we may recommend to the populace, as well of the upper as of the lower classes, the moral and the spiritual elements of the Christian system; while *for ourselves*, it is a fixed principle, and it is the one postulate of our philosophy, that we utterly reject as incredible whatever savours of the supernatural. There must be no MIRACLE in *our* gospel. But, if not, then what is to become of the Christian documents! As Christian teachers, how shall we deal with the Evangelists? It is on the sharp ridges of this reef that Modern Thought will strike, and go down. There is here no way of escape. The English writers now in view have allowed themselves to be moored by their German masters into a still water, with ruin around them in every point of the compass, when next the wind shall blow!

"Mystifications and evasions put out of view, it is manifest that the momentous controversy of the present time turns upon the belief we shall arrive at concerning THE PERSONAL CHARACTER OF CHRIST. It is on this ground that the question must in future be argued, and an issue sought for and accepted: 'What think we of Christ?' Was it so that, while He professed to work miracles in the name of God, He yet did nothing which has not been done by many an impostor?"—Pp. 315, 316.

Thus powerfully does the reviewer characterize some of the concessions that embarrass modern thought:

"On all sides it is now admitted—and the apostles of Atheism have freely admitted it—that the Christ of the Evangelists is a Real Person, in the fullest *historic* sense; and, moreover, that the splendour of His virtues and wisdom

beams forth from these inartificial records. It is granted—or one might say, it has been carried by acclamation—that within these writings there is exhibited an unmatched sample of Human Nature—a bright reality of goodness and of truth."—P. 317.

The reviewer presses the anti-supernaturalist to reconcile the CHRIST whom all men now commend, with the CHRIST of the Gospels, and argues that if the supernatural is to be excluded, if miracles are to be denied, the whole history is involved in a cloud of moral ambiguity.

"Never again can it be attempted to obviate the difficulty by the disintegration of the text of the Gospels; for the rules of textual criticism forbid this to be done. Nor can it be allowed that we should disintegrate them in an historic sense—by expunging, or setting off, those portions out of which the perplexity arises. To do this, would be a violence which the necessities of a desperate argument will not warrant. Nor may we, when we come to the narrative of a miracle, silently put it on one side, as if it did not concern us, or as if we might quietly pass on to a parable, or to a preceptive discourse, heedless of what we have left in the rear. Nor can it be of any use to say, 'Miracles are not available as *evidences now;* for we rest our modern faith upon other grounds.' This evades the difficulty; it does not meet it. The narrative *is* where it is, in the text; nor is there any power on earth that can dislodge or remove it—if indeed textual criticism affirms the passage to be genuine. This portion—containing the narrative of an event which unquestionably was *out of the order of Nature*—so intertwines itself with the context, and the circumstances of the event are so woven into the personal behaviour of Christ, and they so form the basis and the reason of what He said and did—they are so tightly wedged into the history, constituting its very framework—that to remove them, otherwise than by an act of sheer violence, is not possible. To attempt any such operation, is to rend the document itself into shreds:—nothing remains that can be worth the pains of an argument about it."—P. 318.

Again, on this subject the reviewer says:

"Vain is it to reiterate the sophism, that 'Miracles, even if ever any such events took place, could be of no service to us now.' Be it so; but they *do* constitute, in great part, the Gospels in our hands; and we must either continue to read these chapters, or we must cease to read them. If we read them, we must plainly tell the people they are fictions! If we cease to read them, then the Scriptures fall away from the popular mind. Christianity, *less* its miracles, will work its own disappearance from the world; nor will it be long in coming to this end. No such issue as this shall come about: the Gospel in its integrity shall outlive whims and sophistries—evasions and disbeliefs of all species."—P. 321.

In a note, the reviewer follows up the subject of the destructive influence of the anti-supernaturalist theory upon the New Testament.

"It may be well to consider what would be the actual consequence, in families and in churches, of an open rejection of the evangelic miracles. To speak now only of the Gospels, we must discontinue the public reading of chapters in the following proportion:—Of the twenty-eight chapters of the Gospel of Matthew, *eleven* must be omitted; of the sixteen chapters of Mark, *eleven* also must be marked off; of the twenty-four chapters of Luke, *thirteen* are on the same ground exceptionable; and of the twenty-one chapters of John's Gospel, *ten* are excluded. Or, otherwise stated, it stands thus: of eighty-nine chapters, forty-five must sooner or later fall out of use in the practice of religious instruction. The Book of the Acts could scarcely be read at all; nor quite half the Epistles."—P. 321.

The reviewer offers some reasons to account for the successes of the

destructive element of modern thought, and thus describes, among other causes, the fascination of the weaker reason:

"In minds astutely constituted there is an irresistible gravitation toward the exceptive side in argument. It is an instinct which impels such minds to look always for a way of escape from a foreseen conclusion;—they make for the chink;—they run towards the hole in the wall. There is a nervous terror of an impending demonstration:—there is a petulant resentment of the tyranny of Truth. Thus it is—as we think—that minds of more sensitiveness than force, yield themselves to the enchantment of theories which they freely confess to be 'thin as air,' because such theories contradict overwhelming reasons. Thus it is that the very strength of the cumulative Christian argument is the real cause of its rejection by many. We need not impute motives of a more improper kind to many who resist that argument: it may be, that the resistance takes its spring rather from a fault of the intellectual habitudes than from any immoral repugnance toward Christian doctrines or precepts."—P. 323.

The attempt to hold a Christianity without the miraculous element in it is an impossibility. The hopes that make Christianity infinitely precious are all destroyed by the anti-supernaturalist theory. The Christ who spoke of immortality is no longer to be trusted:

"— for He Himself 'died and was buried,' and in that sepulchre, or in some unnoted grave, He underwent the destiny of all men. In that sepulchre, or elsewhere, the 'Desire of all nations,' the Hope of the world, mingled His dust with the dust of others! What remains to us after this destruction has had its course, is—an empty tomb, the spices that long since have spent their aroma, the grave clothes, the folded napkin:—what remains to us is a 'teaching,' more pure and sublime indeed than that of the Greek philosophy; and yet it is a teaching which is so intimately commingled with delusions, if not frauds, that Morality will be better honoured henceforth by consigning our Christianity to oblivion, than by conserving it as a perpetual offence to the instincts of virtue, to common honesty, and to sound reason!"—P. 330.

The reviewer grants but a short lease to the atheistic influences which now agitate modern thought: he believes that a reaction, gaining strength from the enormities of the prevailing infidelity, will not be slow to come.

While we dissent here and there from a thought or a phrase of the reviewer, we feel a general agreement with his views. To one remark in his concluding paragraph we heartily subscribe:

"The strength of modern disbelief is that which it draws from the misapprehensions, from the groundless alarms, from the superstitions, or the rigid prejudices, and, most of all, from unwarrantable dogmatic reasonings of a time gone by."—P. 331.

We commend the whole article to the careful perusal of all who think religious truth a thing deserving their regard and toil.

The Framlingham Pulpit. 12mo. Pp. 23.

THERE has appeared in "The Suffolk Chronicle" of the past and the present year a series of pulpit sketches of the county. This pamphlet contains a reprint of the sketches that related to the town of Framlingham. The ministers who are selected for portraiture belong to the Independents, the Church, the Wesleyans and the Unitarians. A spirit of catholic kindness pervades the sketches both of the sects and the selected preachers. Nothing, perhaps, more marks the advances made

in theological liberality than the treatment of Unitarians and their meetings by the provincial press. Instead of entire exclusion, or a brief and dry notice at the best, Unitarians are now in their turn fairly admitted to their rightful portion of publicity. It is something gained when a newspaper critic of considerable ability makes the concession, that "Unitarianism in doctrine is almost as old as Christianity." The Unitarian would say, Quite as old. Again, it is pleasant to read a statement like this: "Unitarianism has been a stalwart opponent to superstition, fanaticism and bigotry, in every form of their apparition,—a foe to wiredrawn theological refinements, and an obstacle in the way of the unreasoning vagaries of hyper-spiritualism. * * * There are thousands everywhere whose private views of the requirements of religion would bring them within the Unitarian pale, but who neither subscribe to its dogmas nor listen to its preachers." The account given of the Framlingham chapel, and of Mr. Cooper, its worthy minister, is distinctive and altogether satisfactory.

Mr. Brooke Herford's Home Pages—Tract Series. Nos. 7, 8 and 9.

This series of popular religious tracts goes on admirably. The "Home Pages" are not learned, and none of the tracts exhaust their subject, but they are well calculated to set people not familiar with the topics handled a-thinking. In style they are light and conversational, and will not repel the casual reader unaccustomed to theological writings. In No. 7, Mr. Brooke Herford discourses popularly on Faith in God, and, in opposition to orthodox churches, shews how simple and heart-moving are the teachings of Christ respecting the Father in heaven. No. 8 is a pleasant 4-page tract, suitable alike for young and old, sufficiently explained by its title, "Try Kindness." In No. 9, we have a slight sketch of the story of the Carthaginian martyr, Vivia Perpetua, from the practised pen of Mr. Thomas Bowring. "Home Pages" like these deserve a cordial welcome at our firesides. We hope they will at once receive it, and that a wide and steady circulation will encourage Mr. Herford to persevere in his excellent efforts.

The Religious Educator. Vol. I. Boston.

This is a new monthly publication, edited by Mr. James P. Walker, of Boston, U.S., and published by the Sunday-School Teachers' Institute. It contains much that will be specially interesting and improving to those who are carrying on the good work of the Sunday-school, and something that all may read with advantage. It is essentially religious and scriptural in its spirit and tone. The details of Sunday-school history which it contains are prevailingly satisfactory.

What is Unitarianism? The Question answered by a Layman. 12mo. Pp. 27. London—Whitfield.

The writer well fulfils his purpose of shewing in plain and simple language what Unitarian Christianity is. The arguments are skilfully arranged, and the writer does not endanger his cause by attempting novelty on a subject which forbids it. The tract may be safely put into the hands of the religious inquirer.

INTELLIGENCE.

OPENING OF THE UNITARIAN CHAPEL AT HEYWOOD, LANCASHIRE.

Heywood is a large and thriving manufacturing village, situated midway between the important towns of Bury and Rochdale. The inhabitants probably number 15,000, and the prevalent character is that so strongly marked in the natives of the adjacent portions of Lancashire and Yorkshire, — strong sense, independence and habitual self-reliance. Not infrequent have been the attempts of the apostles of Secularism and Infidelity to win over to their cause the people of this district: if in some instances they have succeeded in scattering their doubts and disbeliefs, there yet remains among the mass of the people a hearty attachment to religion and its institutions. In few districts do places of worship more quickly arise than in Heywood. We owe it to the sagacity and indomitable zeal of the Rev. John Wright, of Bury, and of his associates in missionary work in that part of the country, that Unitarianism has now taken its place in Heywood, side by side with Episcopalianism, Methodism and Independency. Four years ago, only a single Unitarian Christian was known to live in the township. By missionary preaching, doctrinal lectures, pastoral visits, and the help of a Sunday-school, an Unitarian interest has now been planted in the place which promises to take root and produce important fruit. The first Unitarian service was conducted in the Temperance Hall. At the first lecture there were but five persons in attendance; but Mr. Wright and Mr. Glover persevered, and soon succeeded in arousing and sustaining the attention and interest of the public. The attendance was progressively good. At the end of twelve months, a meeting was called of those that were favourable to the establishment of a Unitarian congregation. There were found then to be sixty persons willing to become subscribing members. A new and better room for meeting was engaged. The expenses of the early Unitarian services were borne by the Bury congregation; but as soon as the Heywood congregation was organized, they resolved, while gratefully acknowledging the valuable aid they had received, to be for the future independent. As soon as they had a room of their own, they established a Sunday-school, which became in a few weeks full to overflowing. The rapid progress of the congregation and the school suggested the idea of building a chapel for themselves. Their first aspirations were humble enough, —a plain room which might be built for £250. The munificent offer of Mr. Thos. Wrigley, of Bury, to contribute £100 to the building fund, induced them to enlarge their scheme. The handsome subscriptions of friends at Bury and elsewhere enabled them to purchase an excellent site and to erect a chapel at the cost of £1300, which for neatness and simple architectural elegance may without disadvantage be compared with many buildings of greater cost. The Heywood Unitarians gave liberally according to their means, not only money, but time and labour, thus materially diminishing the cost of the chapel. For the first two years, the services were mainly conducted by Mr. Benjamin Glover, helped occasionally by Mr. Wright and other ministers of the district. Since that time, they have formed part of the valuable organisation of the Missionary Society of East Lancashire.

Wednesday, November 14th, was the day appointed for the opening services. A fine morning (succeeded, however, by one of those drenching afternoons so often experienced in this district) assisted to bring together a very large congregation, composed not only of people of the immediate district, but of friends from London, Bury, Rochdale, Manchester, Liverpool, Dukinfield, Oldham, Swinton, Blackley, Sheffield, Stannington, and many other places. Amongst the ministers present were Rev. John Wright, Rev. W. H. Channing, Rev. F. Baker, Rev. W. Gaskell, Rev. Dr. Beard, Rev. R. B. Drummond, Rev. James Bayley, Rev. G. Hoade, Rev. J. C. Street, Rev. John Robberds, Rev. Charles Robberds, Rev. John Gordon, Rev. S. Macdonald, Rev. E. Hopkinson, Rev. L. Taplin, Rev. — Lunn, Rev. J. Harrop, Rev. James Whitehead, Rev. W. Moon.

The new chapel stands on an elevated site, just clear of other buildings, but near the best part of Heywood. Its front elevation is, we believe, due West. It is cruciform, the transepts being N. and S. It is a plain but substantial stone edifice, possessing enough of the architectural and ecclesiastical character to please the eye, without having anything expended in mere ornament. It is light within, the windows being in lancet form, and sufficient in number to dissipate the *dim* religious light, which, however poetical, is practically far from convenient. As a whole, the building is considerably larger than the congre-

gation at present needs, and is capable of holding 500 worshipers. It is intended to devote the whole of the East end of the building, including the two transepts, to the purposes of the Sunday-school, which is already a large one, and is well conducted by the Unitarians of Heywood. This portion of the building will be separated from the rest by a removable partition and by drapery. In front of these the pulpit will stand, and there will be ample accommodation for an ordinary congregation of from 200 to 300 persons. The building is approached by a porch at the West end, measuring 10 ft. 6 in. by 8 ft. 9 in., and communicates with the chapel, which is 42 ft. 9 in. long by 35 ft. broad. The school-room at the East end, formed by the transepts and chancel, measures 51 ft. 3 in. by 24 ft. 6 in., and is intended to be added to the chapel when the present accommodation afforded by the chapel becomes too small. The height of the building to the eaves is 18 ft., and to the ridge 41 ft. The roof is an open one, and, together with the pews, is stained and varnished. The chapel is built in the Gothic style of architecture, and its cost when thoroughly completed will amount to £1300, towards which about £800 had been raised by subscription before the opening services commenced. Mr. Joseph Chattwood, Union Square, Bury, is the architect, and Messrs. Hobson and Glassbrook, Hornby Street, Heywood, are the builders.

The service was opened impressively by Rev. John Wright and Rev. F. Baker. Rev. W. H. Channing, of Liverpool (from John xi. 52), preached an instructive and eloquent sermon in illustration of the aim and power of Christianity in gathering together and uniting the scattered children of God. In justice to the occasion, the preacher explained with great clearness and force the distinctive doctrines of Unitarian Christianity. The sacred music was assisted by a harmonium and by the excellent choir of the Bury Unitarian congregation. At the close of the sermon a collection was made, which amounted to the liberal sum of £77.

From the chapel the friends proceeded to the Mechanics' Institution, which was completely filled by the assembled guests and presented a very animated sight. The Chairman, Ivie Mackie, Esq., ex-Mayor of Manchester, and principal guests (including Thomas Wrigley, Esq., John Grundy, Esq., R. T. Heape, Esq., and his brother, T. A. Ward, Esq., Robert Heywood, Esq., David Martineau, Esq., J. T. Hart, Esq., and many ladies) were seated on a dais. The refreshments provided were on a more than usually liberal scale. So large was the attendance that several of the tables had to be twice served.

Tea being over, the chair was taken by Mr. Ivie Mackie, who has just retired with great honour from fulfilling for three consecutive years the important duties of the Mayoralty of Manchester. He discharged the office of Chairman with urbanity and remarkable success, giving just the right tone to the proceedings, and sustaining the hearty sympathy which the occasion inspired and deserved. We must not attempt to give even a sketch of the speeches, but must content ourselves with naming the speakers and their topics. The Chairman opened the proceedings with an interesting outline of his own theological history and a review of the leading doctrines of the orthodox church. He bore animated testimony to the power of Unitarianism to satisfy the understanding and the affections, and to make a man a good servant, a good master, a good citizen and a good Christian. Rev. Wm. Gaskell proposed a resolution expressive of the good wishes of the meeting towards the Heywood congregation, and enforced it by a powerful and most cheering speech. Mr. John Grundy, of Summerseat, proposed a sentiment recognising the importance of Unitarian missions, one of the first and best fruits of which was before them in the Heywood congregation and chapel. A fine, manly, earnest tone of thought characterized Mr. Grundy's address. It was presently followed by addresses of great power from Mr. Thomas Wrigley and Rev. John Wright. Mr. Benjamin Glover, to whose able and zealous labours the Heywood congregation is so largely indebted, gave a very spirited sketch of its history and growth. In nearly all these addresses (and we have rarely listened to better) there were references to the desirableness of an early extinction of the debt on the chapel. The statement of the exertions and sacrifices of the Heywood people evidently made a deep impression. At this period, the members of the deputation in attendance from the Unitarian Association, composed of Mr. J. T. Hart, Mr. David Martineau and Rev. R. Brook Aspland, presented themselves to the meeting. Mr. Hart handed in the amount of a grant by the Association of £25, and Mr. Aspland gave a cheque from Mr. Alfred Lawrence, who had been appointed in the deputation, but who was prevented by business from attending; and presently the Chairman announced a series of additional subscriptions—from Mr. Wrigley, £50; Mr. John Grundy, £50; Mr. Benjamin Heape, £25; Mr. R. T. Heape, £10 (the latter gentleman had previously given £100). These and other subscriptions

swelled the contributions of the day to £246. After an interval and some sacred music effectively given by the Bury choir, the proceedings were resumed, and Rev. John Gordon in a beautifully lucid and thoughtful speech, in which he passed in review many of the religious signs of the times, proposed a resolution recognizing the importance and value of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association. It was seconded by Mr. R. T. Heape, and suitably acknowledged by the Secretary, Rev. R. Brook Aspland, who followed up the observations of Mr. Gordon by dwelling on some of the grounds of hope and confidence on which Unitarians might cheerfully rest. It was much regretted that the early hour at which the Liverpool train left, deprived the meeting of the pleasure of listening to Mr. Channing. But the meeting did not forget (at the instance of Rev. John Wright) gratefully to acknowledge his admirable opening sermon. The time for departure arrived long before the role of the evening's proceedings was fulfilled, and many topics and speakers were with regret passed over. The proceedings terminated with a vote of thanks to the Chairman, received by the meeting, somewhat thinned by previous successive departures, with that enthusiasm with which a Lancashire Unitarian audience recognizes the faithful and able performance on the part of their friends of public duties.

Thus terminated a most interesting and satisfactory meeting, one which greatly encouraged the congregation at Heywood and made a very great impression on the people of the district, who learnt from it that Unitarianism is not the cold and chilling religion which its opponents describe, but one which can rouse its friends to united, zealous and liberal action.

On the following Sunday, notwithstanding intense cold, preceding a fall of snow, very large congregations again assembled; that in the afternoon filled every part of the building in which seats were placed. Again there were kind friends present to help from Rochdale and Bury, but of course in less numbers than on the opening day. The services were conducted by Rev. R. Brook Aspland, of Hackney, who took occasion to discourse on the moral influences of social worship, and on the proper characteristics of Christian and spiritual worship. Collections were again made amounting to £31. The total amount raised by these opening services was £277, and when it is remembered that the Heywood congregation is composed almost exclusively of working men, such a result must be hailed with a feeling of surprise.—To their Unitarian neighbours, and especially to the Bury congregation, the Heywood people feel that they owe a heavy debt of gratitude. They look with complacency and joy on the religious building that has been erected. The debt now remaining, not much exceeding £200, will, we doubt not, be soon wiped off; and we cordially recommend the case of this promising congregation to the consideration of all our Societies and Fellowship Funds, and to the aid of individual generosity. When the building is free of debt, steps will probably be taken to secure the services of a stated minister.

HALF-AN-HOUR AT SCISSETT.

One of the pleasing and hopeful features of the progress of our religious views may be found in the fact, that many of the villages throughout our country are now favoured with their Unitarian meeting-houses, where those who have adopted our views can meet for the worship of God the Father, in the name and as the disciples of Christ.

A short time ago, being in the neighbourhood of Huddersfield, we were induced to go a few miles into the country towards Clayton West and Scissett, large manufacturing villages, where we had the pleasure of joining in worship with a congregation in a neat and commodious Unitarian chapel in the village. It appears that a gentleman in the neighbourhood, William Robinson, Esq., has taken a lively and active interest for some time past to establish among the people a place of Unitarian Christian worship and instruction. His character, zeal and labours have proved very successful among the people, and we have no doubt but ultimately a minister will be settled in this place. The service was well attended, and we never united with a people in worship who seemed more firmly joined together and attentive to the whole of the religious duties of their church. A large Sunday-school, we were informed, had been established, and the teaching and the attendance had been very successful. Many adult persons were attending the classes and learning reading and writing and summing as well, whose early schooling had been neglected. The kindness of the members of this little church who had been more favoured in their youth is duly valued by the pupils. We found as well a library of about 700 vols. of books had been formed since the opening of the chapel. It is called "The Scissett Circulating and Sunday-school Library," which is stated to be the inalienable and irremovable property of the Unitarian congregation assembling in the Mission church at Scissett. We were gratified to learn that the Committee was

always to be formed of eleven of the members of the congregation; for we have known one or two places where our friends in the largeness of their hearts have allowed the books and funds collected by themselves and contributed by ministers and friends of our church, to lapse into the hands of men who were not members of our churches, and who cared nothing for worship, and helped to exile religion from the very place that had established the other means of improvement. The books at Scissett were of a really instructive and interesting nature. We found the preachers who conducted the services every Sunday belonged to the Yorkshire Unitarian Mission Society. We forget the number of preachers on the plan; but among the laymen appointed we were pleased to find the regular ministers of the district were taking a fair share of appointments among the villagers. They spoke highly of the kindness of the ministers and lay preachers. It was pleasing to hear the remark, that they always thought the last sermon, whoever preached it, was the best. Nothing could better shew their appreciation of the labours of those who come among them than this, and the benevolent and devotional character, rather than the fastidious and critical, which distinguished them, and so well becomes members of Christian churches.

We repeat, it is pleasing and cheering to find in different parts of our country ministers and laymen are joining hands to keep open chapels that for a time have no appointed ministers, and opening out new places of worship in our towns and villages. We had recently a plan of lay preachers of one of our northern districts in our hand for supplying our chapels, and among the gentlemen who had thus volunteered we found four of them were the principal editors and contributors to four of the leading papers of that part of the country. Silently and effectually are our views finding their way to all the towns and villages of the country. Among the villagers there is a great deal of Bible reading; and they have but to be shewn the truths we inculcate are of the Scripture, and those views we oppose are unscriptural, and they will adhere to us. If our good friends who are helping on this work in their several places not only support a character of high moral worth and intelligence, but of godly sincerity and piety and faithful attendance to public worship, added to the other numerous good qualities so many of them possess, many will be led to the adoption of a more simple, scriptural and rational faith, and to glorify our Father in heaven.

The facts before us are a complete answer to what Cardinal Wiseman alleged some years ago, that our views, promulgated among the uneducated and working classes of the country, would lead them to abandon not only what we considered superstitions, but all religion as well. "Never yet," said the Cardinal, "had it been able to exercise a salutary influence on that class." The contrary we know to be the fact. At our meetings we have heard the rough-handed quarrymen and the pitmen declare they had found a joy and peace in our views that had saved them from infidelity; and we have seen the poor fisherman sitting in his humble home reading his Bible, to which he was drawn through our representations of Christian truth. We say to our village churches, God-speed you; go on and prosper! You will make a home of acceptable worship for many, both rich and poor, who are sick and weary with the dogmas of the Trinitarian faith.

CHESTERFIELD SUNDAY-SCHOOL AND CONGREGATIONAL ANNIVERSARY.

The annual sermon in behalf of the Sunday-school connected with the place was preached in Elder-Yard chapel, Chesterfield, by the Rev. A. M. Creery, B.A., of Stockport, on the evening of Sunday, Oct. 28. The chapel was well filled, and at the close of the discourse a collection was made for the benefit of the school, amounting to £17. 12*s.* 6*d.*

On the following evening, Monday, the 29th, the annual soirée of the congregation was held in the large school-room, and was very fully attended, about 250 adults having sat down to tea. The room was very beautifully decorated with festoons of evergreen and with numerous large engravings and paintings, lent chiefly by Mr. Barnes, a member of the congregation. Frederick Swanwick, Esq., of Whittington, was in the chair, and the meeting was addressed by Revds. J. J. Bishop, B.A., of Loughborough, J. Page Hopps, of Sheffield, A. M. Creery, B.A., A. W. Worthington, B.A., of Mansfield, T. R. Elliott, of Ilkeston, Henry Solly, of Lancaster, and F. Bishop, of Chesterfield. The latter gave an encouraging report of the different institutions of the congregation, especially of the Sunday-school, which he spoke of as being in a very flourishing condition. Messrs. Woodhead, W. Glossop, Barnes and Sterland, members of the congregation, also addressed the meeting. Several hymns were sung by the whole assembly in the course of the evening, and the proceedings altogether were of a cheering and interesting character.

A local paper gave a full report of the

meeting; and the circumstance of three of the ministers who took part in it having been converts to Unitarianism from orthodox bodies, excited considerable notice in the town, and drew forth in the paper following that which contained the report an ill-natured and uncandid comment from a writer signing himself "Veritas." As there was good reason to believe that this letter, unworthy as was its tone, was from an influential quarter, it was met with a plain and fitting rebuke by Rev. Francis Bishop in the same paper of the following week, and also by a member of the Elder-Yard congregation, who signs himself A Unitarian Christian.

NEWINGTON-GREEN CHAPEL.

This ancient Presbyterian meeting-house, with which so many names dear to piety and to literature are associated, was re-opened on Sunday, November 11th, after having been closed during the preceding four months for repairs and enlargement. The sermon was preached by the Rev. T. Madge, and was marked by all his usual strength and clearness both of thought and expression. There was a special musical service, in which the choir received the kind aid of Miss Philp and other friends from the Free Christian Church, Camden Town. The collection towards the repairing and enlarging fund was liberal, and all strangers present expressed their gratification at the entire success with which the alterations had been carried out. Several persons overstayed the service, to contemplate with interest the memorial-tablets to Mrs. Barbauld, Dr. Price and the poet Rogers, which are replaced in the enlarged building with greatly improved effect.

A REMARKABLE TRIBUTE OF RESPECT.

The recent marriage of Sir John Bowring to Miss Castle, of Clifton, afforded an opportunity to his numerous Unitarian friends of testifying their feeling towards him. Two magnificent Bibles were procured. That for Sir John Bowring was a large paper copy of Bagster's Polyglot Bible (consisting of versions of the Bible in eight different tongues). This noble volume had been the property of the late Dr. S. Lee, the editor of this Polyglot, and may be considered in some respects unique. It was splendidly bound by Mr. Bagster. The Bible designed for Lady Bowring was a large paper copy of Bagster's Comprehensive Bible in quarto, bound in blue morocco, with gilt clasps and ornaments, and the gilt edges beautifully illuminated with Scripture passages in scroll. For each Bible an oak box was provided, lined with crimson velvet. A magnificent reading-stand was also procured, of carved oak and covered with crimson velvet. The marriage ceremony took place at Lewin's-Mead chapel, Bristol, in the presence of an unusually large and brilliant assembly of friends, and with such a concourse of spectators as probably was never before gathered within the walls of that building. The service was read by Rev. R. Brook Aspland and Rev. Wm. James. At the conclusion of the ceremony, Mr. Aspland introduced a deputation, consisting of Mr. Wm. Wansey, Mr. Henry A. Palmer, Rev. Edwin Chapman, Rev. Wm. James and himself, who were charged with a peculiar and pleasing duty. Mr. Wansey then, pointing to the beautiful folio which was placed on the reading-stand within the altar rails, addressed Sir John Bowring in these words: "As one of a deputation appointed for the purpose, I have the honour and pleasure of presenting to you a Bible, which is offered to you by the body to which we all belong, as a testimony of the high sense they entertain of your worth and merit, of your consistency and courage, and of your perseverance in the assertion of your principles, through a long and honourable life. It is not my province to trespass much on your time, or that of the ladies and gentlemen present this morning. I will only say that we all join heartily in our congratulations to you and Lady Bowring on this important and deeply-interesting occasion, and would express to you our best wishes and our ardent desire that health and happiness may attend you for many, many years. Of the rest, the inscription on this book will be the best testimony, and will remain a standing memorial of the views we entertain." Mr. Wansey then read the inscription, as follows: "This Bible was presented at Lewin's-Mead Chapel, Bristol, November 8th, 1860, to Sir John Bowring, Kt., LL.D., &c., on the morning of his marriage to Miss Castle, as an offering of respect and affection, from Unitarians of the United Kingdom, America, Transylvania and Australia, including persons of many ranks and classes, ministers, missionaries, students and Sunday-school teachers, to mark their appreciation of his fidelity to religious convictions, and of the services which he has rendered, by his writings and example, to the cause of pure Christianity."

Rev. R. Brook Aspland, holding in his hands the quarto Bible, said, "The honour is entrusted to me of presenting to you, Lady Bowring, a Bible which is the offering of many friends in Bristol and elsewhere. It will suffice if I read you the inscription,

which will itself explain the views of those who offer it. 'This Bible was presented at Lewin's-Mead Chapel, Bristol, on the morning of her marriage, Nov. 8th, 1860, to Lady Bowring, by Unitarians of both hemispheres, friends and admirers of her Husband, with sincere wishes for their united happiness.'"

Sir John Bowring, addressing the gentlemen of the deputation, said, with deep emotion, "Believe me, I feel too much and too deeply to give adequate expression to the thoughts and feelings which rush through my mind. On this day, and on this occasion, speech fails me to express the emotions by which I am moved. I will take an opportunity, when I am more equal to it, of putting on record some of those thoughts and feelings, and will only say now that I thank you most warmly, for myself and Lady Bowring, for all your kind wishes, and for these most valuable testimonies of your regard."

The whole proceeding excited the deepest interest throughout the congregation; and at the close of the ceremony many eagerly pressed around the altar to inspect and admire the splendid gifts.

We have received from Mr. Wansey for publication the following interesting letter, the promised acknowledgment:

"Hotel du Louvre, Paris,
Nov. 12, 1860.

"My dear Sir,—In the history of a long and eventful life, no circumstance has occurred of more touching interest than that which you associated with the memorable ceremonial of Thursday last.

"Such a mark of the kindness and affection of my Unitarian friends, coming in so acceptable and appropriate a shape, could not fail to awaken the strongest emotions of pleasure and gratitude.

"To yourself and to those you represented, allow me to convey the expression and to request the communication of the deep emotion with which I received the sacred gift, and to record the humble hope that its divine precepts may ever be to me, and to her with whom on that occasion I was so happily united, the guide and the comfort of our coming days.

"I remain, my dear Sir, with every sentiment of respectful esteem, yours very faithfully, JOHN BOWRING.

"To Wm. Wansey, Esq., Bognor."

ELECTION OF MR. J. C. LAWRENCE AS ALDERMAN.

Some of our readers may not be aware that Mr. J. C. Lawrence, the zealous Secretary of the London District Unitarian Society, has just been elected an Alderman of the city of London for the ward of Walbrook. The contest between him and Mr. Linklater,—in politics a Tory, in religion belonging to the orthodox body,—was a very severe one. Mr. Lawrence's opponents worked the "religious question" as much as possible to their advantage, and inquired of the electors whether they would vote for a *Unitarian*. This induced several to withhold their votes, though previously promised on behalf of Mr. Lawrence. But in spite of all the bigoted opposition raised on religious grounds, the close of the poll shewed a majority of nine votes for Mr. Lawrence. We rejoice at the result, as it is a triumph of liberal principles, both in religion and politics, over bigotry and intolerance; and we congratulate Mr. Lawrence on the attainment of a sphere of civic rank in which he may find full scope for the exercise of his intelligence and public spirit in the promotion of Reforms as much needed, perhaps, on the one as on the other side of Temple Bar. To Dr. Cumming it may possibly afford another sign of the "Coming Desolation"—and as good a one as some of his other "signs"—that two Unitarians, of the same name and family, should now be found in the Court of Aldermen!

OBITUARY.

Sept. 22, at the North Shore, Sydney, FREDERICK PIPER, Esq., of the firm of Levicks and Piper, son of Rev. H. H. Piper, formerly of Norton, near Sheffield.

Oct. 14, at Belfast, Rev. GEO. HUTTON, aged 54.

Oct. 24, at Liverpool, LISA BEATRICE JOHNSTON, third daughter of Rev. W. H. CHANNING, aged 5 years and 7 months.

Oct. 27, Mr. ROBERT MUIR, for many years the zealous superintendent of the Sunday-schools of the Church of the Divine Unity, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Many influential members of the church and a large number of children belonging to the schools followed him to the grave, to shew their affectionate respect to his memory. On the following Sunday morning, Rev. William Newton conducted a funeral service in the church, in which he spoke of

the conscientious zeal of Mr. Muir in the performance of the duties of the Sunday-school, and urged upon others to follow in the footsteps of the departed.

Nov. 5, at Edgbaston, Birmingham, aged 78, Mr. WILLIAM READ, a native of Gloucester and many years an inhabitant of Cheltenham, and a member of the Unitarian congregation in that town. From Toryism and Trinitarianism he changed, when past middle life, to Liberalism and Unitarianism. He married first a daughter of a beneficed clergyman, and afterwards into a respectable Herefordshire family. His four surviving children, two by each wife, know that in all the relations of life he was a kind and useful man. His eldest son is minister of Salem chapel, King's Lynn. T. J. R.

Nov. 8, at his residence, Freasley, near Tamworth, JOHN LAKIN, Esq., in his 81st year. Venerable alike for age and character, this excellent man passed through a long life in the quiet exercise of the virtues that adorn the Christian name and profession. Of him it may be truly said, that in simplicity and godly sincerity he had his conversation in the world. He was the oldest member of the Tamworth Unitarian society, and from his youth up had attended the chapel services there, never being absent save from circumstances beyond his control. His piety was fervent, steady and rational, the will of God being the actuating motive of his whole life; and his death was calm, evincing the peace that passeth understanding. The simple Unitarian faith, the faith once delivered to the saints, was found amply sufficient to sustain and to cheer in the last hour. The meek and humble servant of the Lord has gone to his grave like a shock of corn in its full season. His departure has left an aching void in our hearts, but we are consoled by the thought that it is "well with him." T. B.

Nov. 8, Sir CHARLES FELLOWES, aged 64.

Nov. 10, at Woodcote, near Liverpool, R. RATHBONE, Esq., aged 72.

Nov. 16, at Lampeter, in the county of Cardigan, Rev. JOHN JEREMY, in the 78th year of his age.

Nov. 17, aged 65 years, at the house of her son-in-law, the Rev. C. W. Robberds, Oldham, JUDITH ANN, the beloved wife of the Rev. T. C. HOLLAND, and sister of the late Rev. J. G. Robberds, of Manchester.

Nov. 24, in the neighbourhood of his residence, Queen Square, Bloomsbury, the Rev. Dr. CROLY. He had only left home a few minutes, and was seen walking apparently in good health, when he staggered, fell, and almost immediately expired. He had been rector of St. Stephen's, Walbrook, for 25 years, and was much respected by his flock.

MARRIAGES.

Oct. 1, at the Octagon chapel, Colegate Street, Norwich, Mr. W. R. BROCK, Bedford-Cross Street, Unthanks Road, to Miss M. LEEST, Upper Walk, Market Place.

Oct. 23, at the Unitarian chapel, Knutsford, by Rev. H. Green, M.A., Mr. WILLIAM HOLLAND CASH, of Bridgwater, to SARAH ANN, daughter of Mr. Wm. WOOD, of Broadheath, Altrincham, late of Knutsford.

Oct. 27, at the Presbyterian chapel, Stand, by Rev. T. E. Poynting, Rev. JOHN DAVIES, M.A., of Wootton-under-Edge, to Miss ELIZABETH NORRIS, of Newport, Isle of Wight.

Oct. 28, at the Unitarian chapel, Swinton, by Rev. C. C. Nutter, Mr. WILLIAM ATKINSON to Miss ANN GREENHAIGH, both of Swinton.

Nov. 2, at Belfast, by Rev. Dr. Montgomery, Rev. JAMES M'FERRAN to JANE, widow of the late James CAMPBELL, Esq., Belfast, and daughter of Rev. Jas. Carley, Antrim.

Nov. 8, at the Old meeting, Framlingham, by Rev. Thos. Cooper, Mr. CHARLES TURNER to MARY, only child of Mr. Daniel DALLESTON, both of that place.

Nov. 8, at Bridport, by Rev. J. Lettis Short, THOMAS MUMFORD to ELIZABETH HALSEY.

Nov. 26, at the Unitarian chapel, Belper, by Rev. Rees L. Lloyd, Mr. WILLIAM NEWBOLD to Miss ANN BOOTH, both of Belper.

GENERAL INDEX.

Adelaide, South Australia, Unitarianism in, 56.
Advanced guard of the human race, 699.
Agate, Mrs., obituary of, 652.
Allen's, Mr. W. J. C., speech at Belfast, 385.
Almanacs for 1860, 51.
American orthodox spoliation resisted, 59.
American Unitarian Association, 522.
American View of the Decline of the Society of Friends, 573.
Anderson, John Astley, obituary of, 260.
Andrew, Mr. George, obituary of, 260.
Anti-sectarianism, 15.
Anti-supernaturalism, 592.
Apostolical succession, 359.
Arianism of the Gothic tribes, 2.
Ashton, Mrs., obituary of, 191.
Ashton, Mr. Samuel, obituary of, 392.
Aspland, Rev. Robert, leader of the Unitarian missionary movement, 200.
Aspland's, Rev. R. B., funeral sermon for Mr. Harris, 196. Sermon and speech at Southampton, 246, 252. Sermon at Dukinfield, 307. Address to Home Missionary Board students, 420. Sermons at Heywood, 770.
Aspland, Mrs. Lindsey, obituary of, 191.
Astley, Mrs., obituary of, 588.
Athens, and what it has done for reason and liberty, 681.
Atonement, the doctrine of the, 244. Lectures by Porter and Carpenter on the, 603.

Bache, Rev. Samuel, on Dr. Winer and his expurgator, 47. On the National Reviewer, 149. Address on laying the foundation-stone of new chapel, 576. On Dr. Cumming, 713.
Baker's, Rev. F., address at Burnley, 256. Tribute of respect to, 321.
Barnes', Albert, Life at Threescore, 178.
Barnett's, Henry M., Discourse on Theodore Parker, 433.
Bath Unitarian chapel, re-opening of, 376.
Bauer, Dr. F. C., wild speculations of, 367.
Beard, Rev. Dr., on the Reformation in Italy, 97. On the statue of Dr. Priestley, 237. Ordination charge, 320. Reasons why I am a Unitarian, 574. Review of Essays and Reviews, 589. Rational Primer, 706.
Bellew, Rev. J. C. M., on persecution, 50.
Bentley on Ducket the atheist, 80.
Best, Paul, two letters of, 632.
Bingley, Mrs., obituary of, 327.
Binns', Mr., Lecture on Theodore Parker, 638.
Birmingham, noble effort for hospital in, 121. Unitarian Brotherly Society, 190. Graham-Street school, 450. Foundation of Unitarian church in, 576.
Bischoff, Mrs., obituary of, 191.
Blackley Unitarian chapel, 581.
Blackley, Martha, obituary of, 715.
Bligh, Mrs. J. P., obituary of, 63.
Bold, Samuel, some account of, 466.
Bolingbroke, Mr. C. N., obituary of, 328.
Bolton Unitarian chapel, 321. District Unitarian Association, 375. Moor-Lane chapel at, 401, 404.
Book of Common Prayer, reform of, 59.
Bowring's, Sir John, scriptural hymns, 10, 96, 164, 202, 429, 495, 667. Lecture on China and its people, 54. Lines on Theodore Parker, 103. Account of, and of his book on the Philippines, 104. Speeches at Southampton, 247, 250. Lines on the Priestley statue, 494—on the birth and destiny of man, 546. Marriage of, 772.
Bradford, meeting at, 437.
Brannon, Mr. Philip, the architect, of Southampton, 252.
Brannon, Mr. George, obituary of, 327, 388.
Brierley's A Day out, 178.
British Almanac, 52.
British and Foreign School Society, 379.

Broad Church, 589.
Brodie's, Professor, speech on Priestley, 510.
Bruce, Mrs., obituary of, 651.
Buckle's, Mr., theory of improvement combated, 681.
Burmann's apostrophe to Grotius, translated, 495.
Burnley, ordination of Rev. W. Robinson at, 256.
Bury St. Edmunds, 326.
Byron's, Lady, lines, Wild Flowers, 409.

Carmarthen College examination, 444. Rev. Stephenson Hunter's address at, 738.
Carpenter, Rev. Benjamin, obituary of, 125. Memoir of, 219.
Carpenter, Miss Sarah, obituary of, 125.
Carpenter's, Rev. R. L., Lectures on the Atonement, 244, 603.
Census Bill, 445.
Cephas and Peter, 497, 566, 637, 692, 761.
Channing's, Rev. W. H., Sermon on Theodore Parker, 638. Sermon at Heywood, 769.
Channing, Lisa Beatrice Johnston, obituary of, 778.
Chesterfield, soirée at, 57. Sunday-school and congregational anniversary, 771.
Child's, Mr., evidence respecting Bible printing, 386.
Children of other Lands, reviewed, 178.
China and its people, 54.
Christ, the mind that was in, 556.
Christianity, truth of, 306.
Church-rates, petition against, 190.
Cirencester chapel, 584.
Clack, Rev. William, obituary of, 390.
Clarke, Mr. Charles C., obituary of, 124.
Clarke's, Rev. J. Freeman, Sermon on Theodore Parker, 639.
Classon, Mr. John, obituary of, 392.
Cleator preachers and subjects, 583.
Codex Argenteus, 5.
Commins, Mr. John, obituary of, 63.
Concession, a theological, 555.
Converts to and from Unitarianism, 583.
Conway, Mrs., obituary of, 328, 587.
Coquerel, Etienne, on the reformation in Italy, 97.
Coquerel, Athanase, on Preaching, 525.
1 Cor. xv. 20, scriptural hymn on, 10.
Cornell, Isabella Mary, obituary of, 327.
Correspondence between a Kentish rector and one of his parishioners, 560.
Crabb, Rev. Habakkuk, 325.
Cranworth's, Lord, Endowed Schools' Bill, 189.
Creery's, Mr., sermon at Bradford, 437.
Crellius de Uno Patre, 79.
Croly, Rev. Dr., obituary of, 774.
Cubley's, Miss, Hills and Plains of Palestine, 508.
Cumming's, Dr., prophetic tribulation trash, 712.

Davenport, Mrs., obituary of, 392.
Davies, Rev. Dr. W., obituary of, 125.
Davis, Mr. William, obituary of, 456.
Davy's, Dr.; speech on Priestley, 511.
Dean, Mrs., obituary of, 260.
Deference to custom, 115.
Derby congregation, letter of, respecting Dr. Hutton, 304.
Development, theological, and progress, 15.
Devonshire Watchman, extract from, 123.
Dillon, Mrs. Frank, obituary of, 327.
Disney, Rev. Dr., 325.
Doctrine to be proved from Scripture, 602.
Drennan, Mrs., obituary of, 125.
Drummond, Rev. R. B., on Rev. George Harris, 127.
Dukinfield, meeting at, on Good Friday, 307.

Eastern Christian Unitarian Society at Framlingham, 448.
Edinburgh Review, 640.
Edinburgh Unitarian congregation, 717.
Ephesians iv. 26, hymn on, 165.
Erasmus and the Vatican Codex, 642.
Essays and Reviews, reviewed, 589.
Evans, Dr. John, 266.
Ewald as a theological critic, &c., 32.
Examiner, the Christian, of Boston, 644.
Exeter, the first city in England for Unitarian worship, 123.

Fear of free inquiry, effects of, 224.
Fellowes, Sir Charles, obituary of, 774.
Filliter, Mary Cogan, obituary of, 456.
Finch, Miss, obituary of, 652.
Fisher, Mrs., obituary of, 260.
Florence, Christian church at, 101.
Framlingham, meeting at, 448.
Framlingham Pulpit, 766.
Francis, Joseph Tuckerman, obituary of, 192.
Free inquiry, 14.
Freeman, Mr., on Unitarian theology, 48.
Frost, Mr. F. A., obituary of, 588.
Fullagar, Miss, obituary of, 64.
Fyson, Mr. R. D., obituary of, 124.

Gangooly, Rev. J. C., and the Indian mission, 515, 579, 580, 647. Ordination in Boston, 518.
Garnham, Rev. R. E., 325.
Gaskell's, Rev. Wm., ordination address, 321. Sermon, &c., at Bath, 377. Address to students of Manchester New College, 457.
George III. and Dr. Priestley, 499.
Glasgow and Rev. George Harris, 482, 490, 620.
Goethe, lines translated from, 746.

Gordon's, Rev. J., memoir of George Harris, 193, 261, 393, 479, 620, 668, 717.
Gothic nation, their origin and faith, 1. Version of the Gospels, 5.
Green's, Rev. Henry, address at Home Missionary Board, 179.
Greenock, Unitarianism at, 271.
Greg's, Mr. Samuel, address at Dukinfield, 315.
Grundy, Mrs. Samuel, obituary of, 456.
Gulston, Bishop of Bristol, 1682, 470, 475.

Hackney congregation, social meeting of, 58.
Ham, Rev. J. Panton, speech and sermons at Southampton, 252, 254. Sermons on the Christian Life, 700.
Hands, Mrs., obituary of, 125.
Harmony of the spheres, 142.
Harris, Rev. George, death of, 64, 125. Memoir of, 193, 261, 393, 479, 620, 668, 717.
Harris, Rev. Abraham, 261.
Harris, Mrs., 262.
Harrison, Rev. William, obituary of, 124.
Hawes, Mr. Benjamin, obituary of, 392.
Heape, Charles, obituary of, 192.
Henry's, Dr. W. C., speech at Oxford, 513.
Hereditary creeds, 273.
Herford's Popular Tracts and Covers, 643, 767.
Heywood, mission chapel at, 715. Opening services at, 768.
Heywood's, Mr. James, speech at Oxford, 513.
Hibbert, Mr. Samuel, obituary of, 125.
Hibbert, Mr. Joseph, obituary of, 456.
Higginson, Rev. Edward, the Unitarian Minister and the National Reviewer, 38, 81, 277, 357. On the Morals of Belief, 568.
Higginson, Isabella, obituary of, 327.
Hincks, Rev. W., and Manchester New College, 496, 564, 696.
Hindoos, religious condition of, 329. Mission, 585.
Holland, Mr. T. C., on the genuineness of the New Testament, 371. On the resurrection of Jesus, 372.
Holland, Mrs. T. C., obituary of, 774.
Hope, Isabella, obituary of, 652.
Hopkinson, Jane, obituary of, 652.
Horsfield, Rev. Frederick, obituary of, 192.
Howse, Mrs., obituary of, 588.
Hunter's, Rev. Stephenson, address at Carmarthen College, 738.
Huntington, Professor, an orthodox convert, 645. Address on Home and College, 705.
Hutton, Rev. Joseph, of Dublin, 297.
Hutton, Rev. Dr., memoir of, 297.
Hutton, Rev. J. H., tribute of respect to, 57.
Hutton, Rev. George, obituary of, 773.
Hymn on opening the Southampton Unitarian church, 246.

Iernon's, Rev. H., speech at Dukinfield, 312.
Ignorant infallibility, 563.
Ilkeston Unitarian chapel, 586.
Ilminster School, Case of the, 703.
India, missions in, 329, 410.
Inspiration, what it is, 600.
Interpreters of Scripture, progressive and obstructive, 599.
Introduction to the Evidences of Christianity, reviewed, 430.
Isaiah lxv. 5, hymn on, 202—xl. 28, hymn on, 429.
Italy, dawn of the reformation in, 97.

James's, Rev. W., visit to the continent, 747.
Jameson, Mrs., obituary of, 260.
Jeffery, Mr. James, obituary of, 391.
Jeremy, Rev. John, obituary of, 774.
Job v. 26, lines suggested by a sermon on, 218.
John xi. 23, hymn on, 429.
Johnson, Edward Henry, obituary of, 125.
Johnson, Elizabeth Maria, obituary of, 716.
Jones, Mrs. W. A., obituary of, 652.
Jowett, Professor, on interpretation of Scripture, 597.

Kell's, Rev. Edmund, tribute to the memory of Rev. George Harris, 125. His last visit to Mr. Harris, 733. Speech at Southampton, 249.
Kenrick's, Rev. J., Roman Sepulcral Inscriptions, 500. Speech at Oxford, 512.
Kenrick, Clara Maria, obituary of, 392.
Kent and Sussex Unitarian Association at Chatham, 582.
1 Kings xix. 4, hymn on, 96.

L. on religious parties and Unitarianism, 11. On the Unitarian church and Mr. Martineau, 166.
L., Poems by, 703.
Lakin, John, Esq., obituary of, 774.
Lancashire and Cheshire Unitarian Association, 1819, 399.
Lawrence's, Mr. Alfred, speech at Southampton, 249.
Lawrence, Mr. J. C., election of, as Alderman, 773.
Le Breton, the late Rev. Philip, memoir of, 756.
Lee, Right Hon. Sir William, C.J., 79.
Leeds congregational letter and resolutions respecting Dr. Hutton, 305.
Lees, Mrs., obituary of, 124.
Leigh, Mrs., obituary of, 652.
Lewin, Rev. Robert, 393, 408.
Linus, Poems by, 703.
Liverpool in Mr. Harris's time, 393.

Lombards, Arians, 641.
London Domestic Mission Society, 380.
London District Unitarian Society, 454.
Lupton, Mrs. Arthur, obituary of, 192.

Macaulay, Lord, 763.
Macdonald, S. F., lines by, 142.
Maclellan, Mrs., obituary of, 390.
Maclellan, Rev. R. E. B., lines by, 465.
Madge, Rev. Thomas, testimonial to, 447. His tribute to memory of Rev. Philip Le Breton, 759.
Mai's edition of the Vatican Codex, 643.
Manchester New College, annual meeting, 116. Examination, 449.
Manchester District Sunday-School Association, 307.
Manchester District Unitarian Association, 374.
Manchester Domestic Mission Society, 374.
Manchester Unitarian Sunday-School Union, 258.
Marriages, 64, 128, 192, 260, 324, 387, 456, 586, 652, 716, 774.
Martin's, Rev. Samuel, sermon at Belfast, 381.
Martin, Ronald, obituary of, 652.
Martineau, Mr., and the Unitarian church, 19. In answer to L.'s inquiry, 113. His and Mr. Tayler's letter to Portland-Street congregation, 113. On voluntaryism, 615. Address at opening of the session of Manchester New College, 680.
Martineau, Mr. Philip, obituary of, 327.
Masson's, Mr., Translation of Winer's Grammar of the New Testament, 47.
Matthew vi. 34, scriptural hymn on, 10.
Matthews', Rev. W., settlement at Huddersfield, 120.
May's, Rev. S. J., Rights and Condition of Women, 178.
Means, Rev. J. C., on the National Reviewer and the resurrection, 143.
Metaphysics in the pulpit to be avoided, 423.
Milton's Last Thoughts on the Trinity, 436.
Ministerial changes, 715.
Miracles a help to faith, 17.
Mission chapel, Rochdale Road, Manchester, 708.
Missions, Christian, in India, 329, 410.
Montgomery, Rev. John, on the Holy Spirit, 53.
Morris, John Reaver, obituary of, 524.
Mosley-Street, Manchester, school party, 708.
Mossley Unitarian chapel and school, 259.
Muir, Mr. Robert, obituary of, 773.
Murch's, Mr. Jerom, speech at Bath, 377.

Natural depravity, 492, 564, 635, 697.
Nayler, Mrs., obituary of, 125.
Neglected biography, No. I., 466.
Newbury, Unitarianism at, 323.
Newcastle, Church of the Divine Unity at, 651, 730. Hanover-Square chapel, 723.
Newington-Green chapel, 772.
Nichols, Remembered Words of, 705.
Non-sectarian church, 570.
North British Review, 763.
North-Midland Unitarian Association at Sheffield, 515.

Oldham, Mrs. Betty, obituary of, 588.
Origen's heterodoxy, 599, 699.
Oxford museum, 187. Inauguration of the statue of Priestley at, 509.

Paley, William, his life and works, 653.
Palmer, Rev. H. V., of York, 584.
Pamphlets, Unitarian, noticed, 244.
Parker, Theodore, 103, 129, 433, 638.
Parliament, education and the Dissenters, 189.
Pauline history of Cephas, 692, 761.
Patent, the Queen's, for printing the Bible, 386.
Payton, Mrs. Henry, obituary of, 524.
Peter and Paul, alleged differences of doctrine of, 360, 497.
Peter and Cephas distinguished, 497, 566, 637, 692, 761.
Philippians iii. 13, hymn on, 164.
Philippine Islands, by Sir John Bowring, 104.
Phillips, Thomas Ayres, obituary of, 327.
Philosophical school in religion, 570.
Physiology for Common Schools, 503.
Piper, Frederick, Esq., obituary of, 773.
Polytheism and Pantheism, 575.
Poole, Unitarianism at, 322.
Pope, the, Rev. W. James's interview with, 755.
Porter, Rev. J. S., on the Ulster revival of 1859, 21, 65, 203. Lectures on the Atonement, 603.
Porter, Millicent Gray, obituary of, 390.
Portsmouth, Good Friday meeting at, 322. Unitarianism at, 323.
Powell, Baden, in Essays and Reviews, 592.
Poynting's, Rev. T. E., ordination address, 319. Glimpses of Heaven, reviewed, 547.
Pratt, Mr. Hodgson, on Christian missions in India, 329, 410. On Education for Indian Natives, 567.
Preaching, different modes of, 529.
Priestley on the resurrection of Christ, 39. Statue of, at Oxford, 187, 237, 446, 494. And George III., 499. Memorials of, 534.
Priestley's, Dr. W. O., speech at Oxford, 512.
Procter, Mr. S. C., obituary of, 716.
Protestant Dissenters' Almanac, 53.
Provincial meeting at Preston, 442.

Psalm xxxiii. 1, hymn on, 96—civ. 34, hymn on, 165—xix. 1, hymn on, 202—cxix. 54, hymn on, 667.
Puritanism, English, candidly weighed, 762.
Puseyite party in the Church, 12.

Ragged schools and the proposed revival, 58.
Rathbone, R., Esq., obituary of, 774.
Raverty's, Captain, Grammar of the Pukto, 704.
Read, Mr. William, obituary of, 774.
Re-conversion from Mahommedanism, 714.
Religious Educator, 767.
Religious Liberty, Principle of, 611.
Resurrection of Christ, 36, 82, 143, 150, 174, 225, 274, 372.
Revelation and science, 572.
Revivals in Ireland, 21, 65, 203, 239.
Robinson, Mr. Thomas, obituary of, 192, 325.
Robinson, Rev. W., ordination of, 256.
Robinson, Robert, 419.
Rodick, Mr. Robert Preston, obituary of, 125.
Rogers, Professor, on Paley, 654.
Roscoe, W. C., and his Poems and Essays, 344.
Ryland, Rev. J. H., on the report of Manchester New College, 174.

Sadler's, Rev. Dr., sermon before Unitarian Association, 451.
Sangster, Mr. Samuel, obituary of, 125.
Sayer, Mrs. J. H., obituary of, 716.
Schleiermacher, Life and Letters of, 154, 286.
Scissett, half-an-hour at, 770.
Scotland and Unitarianism, 268, 668.
Scott, Mr. John, obituary of, 260.
Scripture forcibly misapplied, 601.
Seaton, Miss, obituary of, 64.
Sea-weeds, by R. E. B. Maclellan, 465.
Servetus and the Restitutio Christianismi, 369.
Short, Mrs., obituary of, 125.
Sign of the times, 62.
Smith, Mr. and Mrs. J. C., obituary of, 328.
Smith, Mr. Benjamin, obituary of, 328.
Smith's, Rev. G. V., Sermon, Jesus Christ the True Foundation, 700.
Southampton, opening of the Church of the Saviour at, 245. Description of the church, 254. Unitarianism at, 323.
Southern Unitarian Fund Society, 322.
Southern Unitarian Society, meeting at Newbury, 514.
Stannus, Miss Catherine H., obituary of, 260.
Steinthal, Mr., on a work of Servetus, 371. His sermon on Theodore Parker, 638.
Stephens, Mrs., obituary of, 456.
Stevens, Mr. William, obituary of, 524.
Stevenson, Mrs., obituary of, 327.
Stockport Unitarian church, 61.
Street, Rev. J. C., ordination of, 318.
Sunday-School Penny Magazine, 53.
Swinton Unitarian congregation, 650.

Tayler's, Rev. J. J., defence of the National Review, 32, 225, 274. Replies to, 81. Criticisms on, 143, 149, 170, 174, 357. Memoir of Rev. Benjamin Carpenter, 219. Memoir of Rev. Dr. Hutton, 297.
Taylor, Mr. Samuel, obituary of, 716.
Temple's, Dr., Oxford Sermon on Science, &c., 571.
Theology in our courts of law, 584.
Thom's, Rev. J. H., Six Sermons, 175, 240.
Thornthwaite, Mrs., obituary of, 327.
Thornton, Mrs., obituary of, 390.
Times, the, on the revision of the Liturgy, 123.
1 Timothy iii. 16, in the Gothic version, 8.
Tischendorf MS., the, 643.
Todmorden, libel case at, 584.
Tottie, Mr. William, obituary of, 456.
Toulmin, Mr. J. B., obituary of, 259.
Transylvanian church and students, 711.
Trinitarian's religious debts to Unitarianism, 633.
Trinity denied by the early Friends, 574.

Ulfilas, the first translator of the Scriptures into a modern language, 1.
Ulster revival of 1859, 21, 65, 203.
Ulster Unitarian Society, 381.
Unitarian Almanac, 51.
Unitarian Association and Dr. Jos. Hutton, 306. Annual meeting of, 451.
Unitarian church, the, 166.
Unitarian Home Missionary Board, 179, 324.
Unitarian Layman and the National Reviewer, 32, 81, 491.
Unitarian Minister and National Review, 357.
Unitarian Quakers in Manchester, 581.
Unitarian Sunday-School Association, 455.
Unitarian theology, its tendencies, 48.
Unitarians ashamed of their name, 19. Reviled by H. N. Barnett, 434.
Unitarianism and religious parties, 11. Three stages of, 199. In Southampton, 245. In the north of England, 710.
Unitarianism, what is it? 767.
Unity of the churches, 408.
University reform, 122.
Untruthfulness, its cowardice, 368.
Upperthorpe (Sheffield) Unitarian chapel, laying foundation-stone of, 707.

Walker's, Professor, speech at Oxford, 513.
Wareham, Unitarianism at, 323.

Warwickshire Unitarian Tract Society at Stourbridge, 578.
Washbourne, Mr. Geo., obituary of, 456.
Watts, Dr. Isaac, and Southampton, 245.
Wellbeloved, Rev. Charles, reference to, 35.
Wells, Mr. William, obituary of, 455.
Western Unitarian Christian Union, 455.
Wicksteed, Mr. John Tylston, obituary of, 388.
Wild flowers, by Lady Byron, 409.
Williams, Rowland, in Essays and Reviews, 590.
Wilson, Rev. H. B., in Essays and Reviews, 596.
Wills, Mr. William, obituary of, 327.
Winer's Grammar of the New Testament, 47.
Wood, Mr. W. Rayner, and the National Reviewer, 491. In reply to Mr. Wm. Hincks, 564.
Wright's, Rev. John, address at Burnley, 257. Address at Dukinfield, 311.
Wyne, liberal minister of Dorchester, 477.

Yates, Mr. James, on Crellius and Bentley, 79. Speech at Oxford, 511. On the memorials of Priestley, 534.
Yorkshire West-Riding Tract Society meeting, 437.

C. Green, Printer, Hackney.

JUN 7 - 1938